

A  
TREATISE  
OF THE FIFT  
GENERAL COVNCEL

Held  
AT CONSTANTINOPLE,  
*Anno 553.* under IVSTINIAN the Emperor,  
in the time of Pope VIGILIUS.

The Occasion being those *Tria Capitula*, which  
for many yeares troubled the whole Church.

VVHEREIN IS PROVED THAT THE POPES  
Apostolicall Constitution and definitive Sentence, in matter  
of Faith, was condemnaed as Hereticall by the Synod.

And the exceeding frauds of Cardinall *Baronius* and *Binius*  
are clearly discovered.

By RICH: CRAKANTHORP D<sup>r</sup>. in *Divinity*, and Chapleine  
in ordinary to his late Majesty King IAMES.

*Opus Posthumum.*

Published and set forth by his Brother GEO: CRAKANTHORP, according  
to a perfect Copy found written under the *Authors* owne hand.



LONDON,  
Printed for R. M. 1634.

And part of the Impression made over, to be vented for the  
Benefit of the Children of JOHN MYNSHEW, deceased.

*Wm. Coach:*  
*at the Minster Church in London*



the Pope, and the Pope's Cardinals, which  
for many years troubled the whole Church.

And the exceeding funds of Cardinal Brown and Blinn  
are clearly discovered.

is ordinary to his late Majesty King James.  
 (D) RICH: CRANTHORP D. in Divinity, and Chaplain

1/11/1914. The following is the report of Geo. Crak, Anthony, according to the report of the writer under the same name and date.



Printed for R. M. 1834  
LONDON

And part of the Impression made over, to be vented for the  
 benefit of the Children of the Mission, &c.

Handwritten text: *Handwritten signature and illegible text*



TO  
**THE RIGHT  
HONOURABLE**

**EDWARD LORD NEWBURGE**  
Chancellour of the Duchie of Lancaster,  
and one of the Lords of his Majesties most  
Honourable Privie Counsell.

RIGHT HONOURABLE,



*In all duty and submission I  
here present unto your Lordship  
a Treatise concerning the fift ge-  
nerall Councell held at Con-  
stantinople, the cause being the  
Controversie of the Three  
Chapters which for many yeares  
troubled the whole Church, and was at length decided  
in this Councell held under Iustinian that reli-  
gious Emperour. This Treatise, now printed, was long  
agoe penned by one well known unto your Honour; your  
sincere affection to the truth of God and Gods cause,  
gives mee good assurance of your favourable accep-  
tance hereof. I confesse indeed, that when I call to  
minde the manifold affaires wherein your Honour is  
daily imployed, the very thought hereof had almost per-  
suaded mee not to interrupt your more serious affaires,  
by drawing your Honour to the reading or view of this*

## THE EPISTLE

Booke: but when I call to minde those respects of love and duty, in which the Author hereof stood bound unto your Lordship, I was againe incouraged in his name to tender it to your Honour: And although I my selfe can challenge no interest in your Lordships favour to offer this, yet your Lordship may challenge some interest in the fruits of his labours, who was so truly (as I can truly speake) devoted unto your Honour. Among many other, hee especially acknowledged two assured bonds of love and duty by which hee was obliged unto you, and your friends; the former arose from that unfained affection which you ever bare him from your first acquaintance in the Colledge; that other, by which he was further ingaged unto you, and your friends, was, when in a loving respect had unto him in his absence, without any meanes made by him, or knowledge of his, he was called by that much honoured Knight Sir Iohn Levison his Patron, your Father in law, unto the best<sup>a</sup> meanes of livelihood he ever enjoyed in the Ministry, where spending himselfe in his studies, hee ended his dayes; during which time your Honour made your affection further knowne unto him by speciall expressions of extraordinary favours: In regard whereof I perswaded my selfe, that I could no where better crave Patronage for this worke, than of your Honour, that it may bee a further testimony of his love againe, who cannot now speake for himselfe. And this I intreat leave to doe, the rather, because I doubt not but hee acquainted your Lordship with his paines and intent in this, and other Tractates of the Councils; <sup>b</sup> for when after divers yeares study bestowed

<sup>a</sup> Black Notley  
in Essex.

<sup>b</sup> See his Epistle to the Reader for the defence of Justification, printed Anno 1616.

## DEDICATORIE.

“flowed in this argument of Councils, hee was desirous to make some use of his labours; his intent was, to reduce all those points into foure severall Bookes;  
“1. That the right of calling generall Councils;  
“2. That the right of highest Presidency in them;  
“3. That the right of the last and supreme Confirmation of them; is onely Imperiall and not Papall.  
“4. That all the lawfull generall Councils which hitherto have beene held; consent with ours, and oppose the doctrines of the present Church of Rome. Some of these hee finished, the fourth hee could not so much as hope to accomplish, and therefore after the examining of some particulars therein, he desisted and weaned himselfe from those studies: And yet after some yeares discontinuance, being by some of his learned friends solicited to communicate to others, at least some one Tract in that argument, consenting to their earnest desire, after long suspence he resolved on this Treatise, as being for weighty and important matters most delightfull unto him. That it was not then published, let it not seeme strange unto your Honour, for having long since finished the Tract of this whole Councell, it was his purpose, that it should have undergone the publike view and judgement of the Church; but when he came (as I can truly testifie) unto them, whose art and ayde is needfull in such a businesse, and found an averfenesse in them, for that it wholly consisted of controversall matters, whereof they feared that this age had taken a satiety, he rested in this answer, as willing to bury it. After this, being upon a speciall  
command



## THE EPISTLE

*Ed. f. 1. 1. Epist. Ec-  
clesie Anglic.  
pont. Archiep.  
Spal.*

*d Eccles 3. 7.*

*e Iude Epist. v. 5*

*f 2 Cor. 4. 6.*

command from his Majesty, King Iames of blessed memory, made known unto him by my Lord his Grace of Canterbury, to addresse himselfe to another worke, bee then desisted from his former intended purpose, and in finishing of that last worke of his, he ended his dayes. Some few yeares after his death being desirous to take a view of some of his Papers, I came to the view and handling of this booke, a booke fully perfected for the Presse in his life time, the publishing whereof being long expected, and of many earnestly desired, it was my desire and theirs, to whose most grave and judicious censure I willingly submitted it, that it might be published for the benefit of Gods Church; and the rather, that it might give some light in the study of the Councels, and animate some of the three score valiant men that are about Salomons bed, being of the expert and valiant men of Israel, unto the attempting and undertaking of the like: Now what his desire was in this, and other of his labours, surely none but the very enemies of God and Gods truth, can take it to be any other than to testifie his unfained love unto God and Gods Church, and to subdue the pride, idolatries and impieties of that Man of sinne, and to strive for the maintenance of the true faith. Now what allowance so ever it may finde abroad among our adversaries, it humbly craves your favourable acceptace at home; and as it is published with no other intent than to gaine glory to God, and good to his Church, so I doubt not but that God, who causeth light to shine out of darknesse, will effectually in time bring to passe, that not onely their violent oppug-  
ning

---

DEDICATORIE.

---

ning of the truth, but their fraudulent dealing also against the same, wil, if not breed in themselves, yet increase in al welwillers unto the truth, a constant dislike, nay, detestation of their hereticall and Anticbristian doctrines, and for your selfe my earnest and continuall prayer to God shall bee, that you may ever continue your religious and ardent desire to advance Gods truth and honour here, which will procure your owne immortall fame in this world, and, through Gods mercy in Christ, eternall felicity in that life, which, being unlike to this, shall neither have end of dayes, nor end of blessednesse.

Barton neare Bury  
S. Edmunds in  
Suffolke, April 19.  
1631.

Your Lordships

humbly devoted

GEO: CRAWANTHORP.

ing of the truth but their fraudulent dealing also  
 gainst the same will if not freed in themselves yet in  
 create in it weakness and the truth a constant dislike  
 and division of their practical and intellectual  
 doctrine and for some few years ago the  
 doctrine of God shall be that you may ever continue  
 your religion and ancient desire to advance your  
 with a new doctrine which will procure your own  
 interest and fame: this is a bad and wrong way of  
 in the truth which is that of which being  
 such as this shall with a new doctrine of which we are  
 of the truth

DEICATON  
 DEICATON  
 DEICATON

DEICATON

DEICATON



AN  
ADVERTISEMENT  
TO THE CHRISTIAN REA-  
der touching the Scope, Argument and ma-  
nifold Use of this ensuing Treatise.



It is not ambition to live in other mens writings, but desire, if I could, to breath some life into them, which hath drawne me of late rather to preface other mens works, than to perfit mine owne. It grieved me much to see such evidences lie in the darke, which being produced to publike view, would give singular light to the truth: And if *Socrates*, the mirrour of modesty in a Philosopher, held it no disparagement to professe, that he performed the office of a *Midwife* to other mens wits, by helping them in the deliverie of those conceptions wherein himselfe had no part: why should I either feare or regard any detraction from the living, for a charitable office in this kinde to the dead? doubtlesse if the office of a *Midwife* be at any time needfull, it is then most necessarie, when the living Child is to be take out of the dead wombe of the parent: Such was this *Posthumus*, in whom I hope the observation of<sup>a</sup> *Plinie* concerning children thus borne will bee verified: *For the most part* (saith hee) *those Children prove most lively and fortunate, of whom the Parents dye in travell*, never seeing them live, who cost them their lives. The instances are many & very illustrious, *Fabius* <sup>b</sup> *Caso*, thrice Consul, *Scipio* surnamed the *Africane*, *Iulius Caesar* the first & most renowned of all the *Romane Emperours*, and our peerlesse *K. Edward 6.* Howbeit I confesse, it is an hard thing to calculate the nativity of a Book, and certainly foretell what hazzard the

<sup>a</sup> *Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 7. c. 9. Auspicacius enee Parente nascuntur, sicut Scipio Africanus primusque Cesarum à Caso matris utero didius: simili modo natus et Manlius qui Carthaginem cum exercitu intravit.*  
<sup>b</sup> *Tert. lib. de resur. carnis. Postumus illos recogitare qui ex illo matris utero vivi aerem hauerunt, Laberius aliqui et Scipiones et Fabius Caso ter Consul.*



# AN ADVERTISEMENT

e Cic. Orator.

d Def. Eccles.  
Angl. cap. 4. p. 19  
De quo toto Con-  
cilio conscriptum  
scias à me li-  
brum integrum,  
in quo innume-  
rabiles Baronij  
fraudes, menda-  
cia, etiam et he-  
reses palam de-  
tectæ, &c.

e Quintil. in-  
stit. Orat. lib. 1.  
c. 4.

impression of a Treatise of this subject may runne, or guesse what argument will please the *divers tastes* of this *distempered* age; yet this I am confident of, that all who exactly view this worke in all parts, and compare it with others, drawne with the same *Pencill*, will esteeme it like the *Minerva* of *Phidias* his *Masterpeece*: It cost him neare as many yeares labour as *Isocrates Panegyrique*, the Prime rose of his flowry Garden, did him. This Author perfected this worke in his life time, and commanded it, after a sort, to the Presse in the last<sup>d</sup> booke hee published by command from supreme authority in defence of the Church of *England* against the calumnies of the revolted Archbishop of *Spalata*, (in these words:) *The Church* "had beene undone if *Vigilius* his decree had taken place; But the" "most holy Emperour *Iustinian*, and the fift Councell then happily" "shewed themselves Pillars of the *Catholike faith*, concerning which" "whole Councell I desire you to take notice of an intire booke written" "by mee, wherein the innumerable frauds, lies and heresies of *Baro-*" "nius are manifestly detected; out of that booke, if it see light and" "come to your hands, you shall understand and plain'y perceive how" "fraile and reedy your *Romane Pillar* is.

In which passage he insinuates, that the argument of it is, *non de stillicidiis, aut aquis pluviis*, not of *Eves droppings* or water passages, but of the *Roofe* of the house and *Arch* it selfe, the authority of *Councils*, and the infallibilitie of the *Papall Chaire*. The Title carried through the whole booke, carrieth not the greatest part of it, *plus e in recessu est, quam a fronte pro-* mittit; his warehouse within is fraught with more variety of rich stuffs thā is set out on his shop. An entire Treatise of the fift generall Councell, hee professedly undertaketh; but *currente rota*, in the prosecution of this argument, hee taketh tardy *Baronius*, and *Binius*, and other *Romish falsaries*; hee runneth through all the later generall Councils; he substantially hand- leth the maine Controversies concerning the power of calling, and authority ratifying Ecclesiasticall Synods, and so cleareth all Antiquity on the Reformed side in points of great moment, that I perswade my selfe, the wiser sort of our learned adversaries, who will by stealth get a sight thereof, will take good counsell, and utterly derelinquish their most glorious, but most vaine and false claime to generall Councils; for

TO THE READER.

for if wee devide the Councils, that beare the still of *Oecumenicall* and *Generall*, according to the different times in which they were held into *pure*, *mixt*, and *wholly corrupt*, the first of undoubted, the second of doubtful, the third undoubtedly of no authority at all; the first are wholly ours, the last are wholly theirs in the middle sort we part stakes w<sup>th</sup> them: 4. of the first ranke have beene heretofore wrested perforce out of the Romanists hands by Bishop *Iewell*, Bishop *Bilson*, D<sup>r</sup> *Renols*, D<sup>r</sup> *Whitaker* and others. The fift, this accomplit Antiquary vindicates also from them, and declareth how in the Councils of the second ranke we share with them; and in fine hee leaveth them nothing intirely, but the *lees* and *dregs* of all Councils, the *Laterane* and *Trent*. *Habeant quod sunt*, let them have these *lees* to themselves, who themselves, *Moab-like*, for these many ages are settled upon the *lees* of their owne corruption.

Had this judicious and industrious Writer bent all his forces against the Romanists false pretended *right* to generall Councils, and forcibly beat them out of that Hold onely, hee had deserved that Eulogiū which the *Jewes* give any *Rabbin*, to whom they are indebted for a wise saying or apt note upon any Scripture text, *זִכְרוֹנוֹ לִבְרָכָה*, sit memoria ejus in benedictione, blessed be is memorie: How much more when he assaulteth the maine fort of the *Romish faith*, and by impregnable authorities and infallible reasons overthroweth the *Popes* supposed *infallibility*, when hee sits in his *Chaire*, and with his *Romane Synod*, determineth out of it questions, and defineth Articles of faith. This is indeed to let *Rome bleed*, in her *Master-veine*, to strike heresie at the roote, to crush the *Cockatrice* in the head; not to batter and breake downe the mudd-wals, but utterly to ruinate the very foundation of the *Tower of Babel*. For howsoever Scriptures, Fathers, Councils, and the Catholike Church, *μοναρχία καὶ ἐκκλησία*, are pompously brought in into their Polemike writings against us; yet the last resolution of their faith is upon the Pope, who gives credit to Fathers, validity to Councils, and authority, at least *quoad nos*, to the Scriptures themselves. This their Champion *Bellarmino* is *ἀντίπαις τοῦ πάλαι ὡς τὰς εἰρήναι*, and *Skulkenius* his second confidently undertakes to maintaine against all oppug-

f Paulus Fagius  
Epist. ad Alber-  
tum est magna  
religio apud Ju-  
deos non subice-  
re nomen eius  
qui vni aliquid  
dixit, docuit aut  
scripsit.  
p. Vid. comment.  
Rabb. passim.

# AN ADVERTISEMENT

h Bell. de Rom.  
Pontif. lib. 4. ca. 1  
in disputatione  
de verbo Dei.  
Iam offendimus  
iudicem contro-  
versiarum non  
esse scripturam,  
nec seculares  
Principes, &c.  
ut proinde ulti-  
mum iudicium  
summi Ponti-  
ficis esse.  
i Bell. de Rom.  
Pontif. lib. 4. ca. 5  
in fine. Si Papa  
erraret precipi-  
endo vitia, vel  
prohibendo vir-  
tutes, teneretur  
Ecclesia credere  
vitia esse bona, et  
virtutes malas,  
nisi vellet contra  
conscientiam  
peccare.  
h Bulla Pij 4.  
super forma ju-  
ramenti professi-  
onis fidei, anno  
Dom. 1564.  
h Skultet. Apolog.  
pro Bell. ca. 6.  
Pontificia pote-  
stas est velut  
cardo fundamē-  
ti, et ut uno ver-  
bo dicam, summa  
fidei Christiane.  
ad 2 Tim. 3. 16.  
h Bell. de verbo  
Dei non scripto  
lib. 4. ca. 4.  
Etiam si scriptu-  
ra dicat libros  
Prophetarum, et  
Apostolorum esse  
divinos, tamen  
non certo id cre-  
am, nisi prius  
credidero, scrip-  
turam qua hoc  
dicit esse divi-  
nam, nam etiam  
in Alchorano  
Mahometi pas-  
sum legimus  
ipsam Alcho-  
ranum de Celo  
à Deo missū, &c.  
o Quicquid non  
inmittitur do-  
ctrine Romana  
Ecclesia, ac Ro-  
mani Pontificis  
tamquam regule fi-  
dei infallibilis, &  
quod etiam sacra  
Scriptura videtur tradidisse et auctoritatē, hereticus est: contra Lutherū.

ners of the Popes transcendent power, and uncontrou-  
lable verdict in a matters of eternall life and death. The Cardinall thus flourisheth, In our disputations about the word of  
“ God we have already shewed, that the Scripture is not the Iudge of  
“ Controversies, nor are secular Princes, nor private persons;  
“ though learned and honest, but Ecclesiasticall Prelates; in our dis-  
“ putations of the Councils it shall bee demonstrated, that Councils  
“ generall and particular may judge of Controversies in religion, but  
“ that judgement of theirs is then of force and validity when the  
“ Pope shall confirme it, and therefore that the last judgement of all is  
“ the Popes, to which all good Catholikes owe such absolute  
“ obedience, that if the Pope should erre by commanding vices  
“ and prohibiting vertues, the Church is bound to beleieve, that vices  
“ are good, and vertues bad, unlesse she wil sinne against Conscience.  
What, sinne against Conscience in not sinning, and not sinne  
against Conscience in committing sinnes knowne by the  
light of nature, if the Man of sin command the one and forbid  
the other? Wee bee to them, saith the Prophet, that call evill good,  
and good evill, put darknesse for light, and light for darknesse, bitter  
for sweet, and sweet for bitter, E. say. 5. 20. If Bellarmine divinity  
be currant, Pope P the fourth needed notto have coyned  
twelve new Articles of faith, affixt to the Canons of the  
Council of Trent: it had beene sufficient to have added this  
one, I beleieve in the Pope his soveraigne infallibility, for this is pro-  
ra and puppis, the Alpha and Omega, the formalis ratio and de-  
monstratio of in of a Papists beliefe. The Popes power (saith Skul-  
kenius 1) is the hinge and foundation, and, to speake in a word,  
the summe of Christian faith: A short summe and soone cast  
up. What then serves Fathers, Councils, Church-Traditions, and  
Scripture it selfe for with them? for little better than Ciphers,  
which being added to the Popes authority in their Arithme-  
tike makes something, but without it nothing. To begin  
with Scriptures, they beleieve them to bee divine, but not be-  
cause the Scripture saith, that all Scripture is given by divine in-  
spiration: For so (saith Bellarmine) wee read every where in the  
Alcoran of Mahomet, that the Alcoran was sent from God, yet we be-  
leeve it not; why then doe they beleieve them to bee the word  
of God? hee answers readily, propter traditionem Ecclesie,  
for the Churches tradition. Silvester Pierius outvies the Cardi-  
nall,



## TO THE READER.

nall, affirming, that the holy Scripture taketh force and authority from the Romane Church and Pope. Vpon which promise of *Patrius, Gretzer* <sup>p</sup> inferres this peremptory conclusion, *We doe receive and reverence that alone for the word of God which the Pope in Peters Chaire doth determine to be so.* Strange divinity to believe, that the Scriptures receive their authority from the Church, that is, that God receives this authority from man. May we not justly upbraid the present Romanists, as *Tertullian* doth the ancient heathen, *apud eos de humano arbitrati divinitas pensatur, nisi homini Deus placuerit, Deus non erit; Homo jam Deo propitius esse debet; With you Deity is estimated by mans valuation, unlesse God please man, he shall not be God, now man must bee propitious to God, for if the Pope be not propitious to the Scripture to allow it for Gods word, it shall not passe for such in Rome.*

As for the Fathers; they deale with their writings as *Faustus Manicheus* did with the writings of the Apostles, in which hee takes it for a good prooffe, that such passages are the Apostles true writings, because they made for him; others were spurious, because they made against him: Fathers, saith *Dureus*, are not to be accounted Fathers, when they teach or write any thing of their owne; which they have not received from the Church, meaning the Romane; and *Gretzer* backs this assertion with a reason drawn from the formall definition of a Father: for, saith he, he is a father of the Church, who feeds and nourisheth the Church with wholesome doctrine, who being set over the Lords household, gives them their measure of Corne in due season; now if in stead of wholesome food and good Corne hee give them Cockle and Tares, he becomes no father but a stepfather, no Doctor but a seducer.

To instance in some particular; *Eusebius Casariensis* when hee seemes to favour Popery, hee is highly extolled by *Lindane* <sup>2</sup>, *Senensis* <sup>2</sup>, and *Possevine* <sup>1</sup>, hee is then a most famous writer of the Church, most learned, worthy to be a Bishop, not of one City onely, but of the whole world; but when the same *Eusebius* lookes awry upon Rome, then hee is branded by *Canus* <sup>2</sup>, *Coesterus* <sup>2</sup>, and *Baronius* <sup>6</sup>, for a stickler for *Arrius*, an *Arrian* heretike, a ringleader of the *Arrian* faction, whose memory is accursed in the second Synod of Nice. *Tertullian* likewise is guilded by *Lindanus* <sup>c</sup> and *Rehing* <sup>d</sup>, with the glorious titles of a very noble

Author;

*p. Gretz. de scif. Bell. lib. 1. de verbo Dei, id solum pro verbo Dei veniamur ac suscipimus, quod nobis Pontifices ex Cathedra Petri tradunt. q. Tertul. Apol. adversus gentes. ca. 5.*

*Angust. lib. 1. contra Faustian. Manicheum. ca. 2. inde probat inquitur Faustianus, hoc illius esse, illud non esse, quia hoc pro me sonat, illud contra me.*

*Dureus adversus Whistlerum, fol. 14.*

*Nec enim patres censentur, cum suum aliquid quod ab ecclesia non acceperunt, vel scribunt vel dicunt.*

*1. Gretz. lib. 2. de iure & more prohibendi libros noxios. ca. 10. Num Ecclesia pater ille dicitur, qui ecclesiam salutari doctrina pabulo alit et pascit, iam ergo si salutari doctrina pabulo admetiamur. Lindan. 2. Zingenda non Pater est sed Paterculus.*

*2. Lindan. Pamphila lib. 1. ca. 17. 2. Senensis lib. 1. titulo Eusebius. 3. Possevine in apparatu sacro. 2. Canus locorum Theol. lib. 7. ca. 3 a Coester. in Apolog. contra Gre-*

*nec. ca. 8. b. Baron. ad annum 340. Lindan. Panoplia lib. 1. ca. 33. d. Rehing. in muris civilatis sancta. fund. 2. et 12.*



# AN ADVERTISEMENT

author, the chiefe of all the Latine Fathers, the great light of Africa, a most ancient Writer and Doctour, most learned, most skilfull, most acute; where hee hath some passages which may bee detorted to give countenance to some Romish superstitions: But elsewhere when in expresse words he oppugneth some doctrines defined now for Articles of faith in the Church of Rome, he is as much besmeared with foule imputations by *Azorius*<sup>e</sup>, *Maldonate*<sup>f</sup>, and *Bellarmino*<sup>g</sup>; An hereticall author, an Arch-heretike, an enemy to the Catholike, and like to the Calvinists, a mā whose authority is not much to be set by, because he was no man of the Church: and as *Euseb.* & *Tertull.* so also *Origen* hath had contrary testimonials from the Church of Rome, when he pleaseth them hee is <sup>h</sup> a famous light of the Church of Alexandria, whom *S. Hier.* calls another *M<sup>r</sup>* of the Churches after the Apostles, a witnesse beyond all exception; But when hee fits not their humour, then he is a Schismatike<sup>k</sup>, a father of the Arrians and Eunomians, a bold<sup>l</sup> and rash man, an obstinate lover of his owne errors.

In Councils the case is yet clearer, for the Cardinall sticks not in most plaine termes to hang all them upon the Popes sleeve: The<sup>m</sup> whole strength & authority (saith he) of lawfull Councils is from the Pope, their<sup>n</sup> judgment then begins to be of force after the Pope shall ratifie them. And what Councils will he ratifie? you may bee sure not the Councell in *Trullo*, for that taxeth the Romane Church by name for inforcing single life upon the Clergy: not the Councell at<sup>o</sup> Constantinople, under *Constantine Pogonate*, for that he accurseth *Honorius* the Pope for an heretike: not the Councell held at *Frankfort*<sup>p</sup> in the time of Pope *Adrian*, for that condemneth their Image-worship: not the Synod of *Pisa*<sup>q</sup>, for in that *Gregory* and *Benedict* Popes, were deposed: not the Synod<sup>r</sup> of *Basil*, wherein *Engenius* was unpoped; nor the Councell of *Constance*<sup>s</sup>, for in it a generall Council is set aboue the Pope, and three Popes were cashiered by their Authority, (I except the later Sessions of the same condemned Councell, which are Gospell with them, because they Anathematize the Wicliffits and Hussites: ) But the second Synod of *Nice* shall be held for a generall Councell, because it defendeth and commandeth the worship of Images, though it be full of blasphemous absurdities and was called by an insolent woman domineering

over

e Azorius moral.  
lib. 8. cap. 16.  
f Maldon. in  
Math. cap. 16.  
vers. 19. p. 340.  
g Bell. de sancto-  
rum beat. lib. 1.  
cap. 5. p. 1938.  
Bell. de Sacram.  
Euchar. lib. 3.  
cap. 6. p. 698.  
h Lind. Panopol.  
el. 6. 2. 24. et 26  
i Duran. contra  
Whit. fol. 109.  
k Canus loc. The-  
lib. 7. c. 3. Mal-  
don. in Joan.  
cap. 1. vers. 3.  
pag. 399.  
l Ribera in Ma-  
lach. Propbet.  
proemium.  
m Bell. de Rom.  
Pont. lib. 4. ca. 3  
Tota firmitas le-  
gitimorum Con-  
ciliorum est a  
Pontifice Roma-  
no, et cap. 1.  
n Conciliorum  
iudicium tum  
demum firmum est  
cum accesserit  
Rom. Pontificis  
confirmatio.  
o An. Do. 681.  
p An. Do. 794.  
q An. Do. 1409.  
r An. Do. 1430.  
s An. Do. 1414.

an. 787.

Irre.

TO THE READER.

over her husband, and devoted wholly to superstition. The Councell<sup>u</sup> of Laterane, though consisting of none in a manner, but the Popes creatures, shall, in despite of the Oecumenicall Councils of *Pisa*, *Constance* and *Basil*, bee held a holy and generall Councell, because it defines, that the Pope is above generall Councils; and for greater reason will the Pope advance the small Conventicle of *Trent* to the honour of a sacred Oecumenicall Councell, because it is thoroughly for them in all points; though, as a learned Bishop, present at that Councell, truly affirms, *that matters in it came to that passe* "through the wickednesse of those hungry *x* Bishops, that hung upon the Popes sleeve, and were created on the sudden by the Pope for the purpose, that that Councell seemed to bee an assembly, not of Bishops, but of Hobgoblins, not of men, but of Images moved like the statues of *Dædalus*, by the sinewes of others.

*u An. Do. 1517.*

*x Dudithius quinque Eccles. Episc. ad Maximilianum secundum Cesar.*

Lastly, for their pretended title of Catholike Church, it may be said of it as it was of *Pompeius* y Sirname in his declining age and fame, *Stat magni nominis umbra*, 'tis but the shadow of a great name; for by it they meane nothing but their particular Church of *Rome*, or the Pope himselfe: Thus *Bellarmino* glosseth upon the words of our Saviour, *Matth. 16.* the Pope, *Peters* successor, is bid to *z* tell the Church, that is, to tell himselfe as Governour, and the Church which hee governs. *Gretzer* a comes off more roundly; *Thou wilt say, they interpret the Church the Pope: I grant it; what then?* And b *Greg de Valent.* By the name of the Church wee understand the Head of the Church, the Pope: and *Bozius* c declares this mysterie more explicitly, The Pope sustaineth the person of all Bishops, of all Councils, of the whole Church.

*y Lucan de bello ciu. l. 1.*

*z Bell de Concil. author. l. 2. c. 10. Dicere Ecclesie, id est, sibi ipse ut praesidi. et Ecclesie, cui ipse praesidet.*  
*a Gretz. defen. Bell. lib. 3. de verbo Dei: Assistantis interpretantur Ecclesiam Patrem, non abnovo, quid tum?*  
*b 12. 14. diff. ult. l. 9. 1.*  
*c Boz. lib. 2. de signis Eccl. ca. 27. See farther in this Treatise; cap. 13. p. 174.*

The learned Author then of this ensuing Treatise foyleing the Pope, consequently foyleth the whole Romane Church, though he take onely *Vigilius* to taske, yet in overturning his Chaire hee overthroweth, as hath beene shewed, all the Romane religion, which is fundamentally in the Popes Decree, and the whole Romane Church, which is virtually, as they teach, in his person. For if Pope *Vigilius*, not as a private man, but as Pope in *Cathedra*, not sitting alone, but with his Synod, may erre, not onely in matter of fact, but in matter of faith, judicially and doctrinally determining heresie, and

com-

## AN ADVERTISEMENT

commanding it to bee received for Catholike truth: and if this decision and determination of his bee reversed, condemned and accursed in a lawfully called; sacred and Oecumenicall Synod, approved by the Christian world; all which are in the following Treatise punctually and uncontroulably proved against all cavils of moderne Papists,

—*Ecquis posthac Paparum numen adoret?*

Will any man hereafter, not wholly given over to be infatuated with *strong delusions*, adore the Popes *Chaire*? or *kisse his foote*? or pawne his salvation upon his *Cathedrall determination*?

By all this discourse thou maist see, Christian Reader, the maine scope of the Author; I shall not need to inlarge upon other questions of lesser moment, though now more in *vogue*, which upon the by and occasionally this learned Writer accutely handleth both in this worke and others, especially in that imposed upon him by our late Sovereigne of blessed memory, in defence of our Church, *Chap. 35, 36, 37, 38, & 78.*

Wherefore sith the Composer of this Treatise is most orthodoxall, the argument of great importance, the manner of handling very exact and accurate, I doubt not but thou wilt give it such entertainment, as that thereby others may bee encouraged to tread in his steps, and to guide thee in the right way. What though the worke be of some bulke and waight? who ever found fault with gold for that it was too massie and heavy? When *Tully*<sup>d</sup> was asked which Oration of *Demosthenes* he liked best, hee answered, the longest; and questionlesse in bookes of this nature, *ceteris paribus*, the largest which meete with all possible; or at least probable objections, and solidly refutes them, give the best satisfaction. Is it not a shame to see in many mens studies idle Poems, *Astreas*, *Guzmans*, and play-books in folio, but divinity books in *decimo sexto*, or slender paphlets, sticht up in blew coats, without any cognizance, glancing at Church or State, or tréching upon Controversies better buried alive, than to bee revived after they are dead; which are cryed up by the common adversary, of purpose to foment discords betweene the professors of the Gospell, that whilst, *Pastores odia exercent; Lupus intret Ovi-*  
le;

<sup>d</sup> *Plut. in vit.*  
*Cicer.*

---

TO THE READER.

---

le, the shepheards are at strife, the Wolfe may make havocke of the flocke, which I speake not for a *justitium* to any errour, or that I wish any way should bee given to those plausible tenents to corrupt reason, which one of late fitly compared to flat bottom'd Boates sent from our neighbouring Countries to land Popery in England. But first my desire is, that all that agree in the love of the same truth, may seek that truth in love, and continually pray for the peace of Ierusalem; next I pray, that <sup>e Psal. 122.</sup> our love <sup>f Phil. 1. 9.</sup> may abound yet more and more in knowledge, and in all judgment, that we may discern things that differ, and so seek by all good and lawfull meanes to destroy the wrigling taylor of the Adder, whose head was smitten off 1200. yeares agoe in a Synod at Palestine, that yet our principall care bee to drive out the Romish Basiliske, or rather the <sup>g Apoc. 9. 11.</sup> King of the Locusts; against whose poyson I commend the ensuing Discourse as a soveraigne antidote.

Lambeth, April 26.  
Anno Dom. 1631.

Thine in the Lord Iesus

DANIEL FEATLEY.

---

---



In the first place we are to be assured that the  
 flocks, which I speak not for a justness, or  
 I wish any way should be given to those plausible reasons  
 to corruption, which one of the like companies to the  
 bottom of the bottom of our neighbouring countries to the  
 in England. But first my desire is, that all these  
 of the church, may see that such a love, and  
 ally - pray for the peace of Jerusalem; next pray, that  
 may abound yet more and more in knowledge, and in all wisdom, that  
 we may likewise things that differ, and to take by all good  
 faithful means to destroy the reigning evil of the  
 to hold head was fifteen off 1200 years ago, and  
 Possessing that yet our principal care is to give out the  
 and Passlake or rather the "way of it" a single point which  
 position I commend the ending. In the first place, I have  
 and more.

London, the 10th of  
 the 10th of the year

Thine in the love of Jesus

JAMES H. H. H.



# THE CONTENTS OF THE SEVERALL CHAPTERS CONTAINED IN THIS ENSVING TREATISE.

Cap.

1.



That Iustinian assembled the first generall Council at Constantinople, to define the doubt of faith which arose about the Three Chapters. Pag. 1.

2. That the first Generall Council, when Pope Vigilius wilfully refused to come unto it, was held without the Popes presence therein, either by himselfe, or by his Legates. pag. 4.

3. That Pope Vigilius, during the time of the first Council, published his Apostolicall Constitution in defence of the Three Chapters. p. 7.

4. That the holy Generall Council in their Synodall judgement contradicted the Popes Apostolicall Constitution, and definitive sentence in that cause of faith made knowne before unto them. pag. 14.

5. The first Exception of Baronius, pretending that the cause of the Three Chapters was no cause of faith, refused. pag. 36.

6. That the first reason of Vigil. touching the First Chapter, why Theodorus of Mopsuestia ought not to be condemned, because none after their death ought Noviter to bee condemned, concerns the faith, and is hereticall. pag. 47.

7. That the second reason of Vigilius touching the First Chapter, why Theodorus of Mopsuestia ought not to be condemned, because hee dyed in the peace and Communion of the Church, is erroneous and untrue. pag. 58.

8. That the third and last reason of Vigilius, touching the First Chapter, why Theodorus of Mopsuestia ought not to be condemned, because he was not condemned by former Fathers and Councils, is erroneous and untrue. pag. 67.

9. That

## THE CONTENTS.

Cap.

9. *That Vigilius, besides divers personall, held a doctrinall error in faith, in his defence of the Second Chapter, which concerns the writings of Theodorus against Cyril.* Pag. 91.
10. *That Vigilius and Baronius erre in divers personall points, or matters of fact concerning the Third Chapter, which was the Epistle of Ibas unto Maris.* 107.
11. *That Vigilius and Baronius in their former reason for defence of the Epistle of Ibas, drawne from the union with Cyrill, mentioned in the later part of that Epistle, doe defend all the heresies of the Nestorians.* 112.
12. *That Vigilius and Baronius in their later reason for defence of the Epistle of Ibas, taken from the words of Ibas, wherein he confesseth Two natures and One Person to be in Christ, doe maintaine all the heresies of the Nestorians.* 138.
13. *Two assertions of Baronius about the defenders of the Three Chapters, refused; and two other against them confirmed; the one, That to dissent from the Pope in a cause of faith makes one neither an heretike nor a Schismaticke: the other, That to assent in faith to the Pope or present Church of Rome, makes one both an Heretike and a Schismaticke.* 170.
14. *The second Exception of Baronius excusing Vigilius from heresie, For that hee often professeth to hold the Councell of Chalcedon, and the faith thereof, refused.* 199.
15. *The third Exception of Baronius in excuse of Vigilius, taken from his confirming of the fift Councell, answered: and how Pope Vigilius three or foure times changed his judgment in this cause of faith.* 213.
16. *That the Decree Pope of Vigil. for Taciturnity, touching the Three Chapters, and the Councell wherein it is supposed to bee made, and all the Consequents upon that Decree, painted out by Baronius, are all fictions and Poeticall.* 225.
17. *That Vigilius neither by his Pontificall Decree, nor so much as by a personall profession, consented to or confirmed the fift Councell, after the end thereof, or after his supposed exile.* 240.
18. *The fourth and last Exception of Baronius in defence of Vigilius, pretending; That the fift Councell, wherein the Decree of Vigilius was condemned, was neither a generall nor a lawfull Councell, till Vigilius confirmed the same, refused.* 266.

Cap.

# THE CONTENTS

Cap.

19. The true notes to know which are General and lawfull Councils, and which are not General, or being General, are lawfull Councils, with the examples of both kinds; and then more of those which be accounted for the reckon after the first, are General lawfull Councils. Pag. 291.
20. How Cardinall Baronius revileth the Emperour Iustinian, and a refutation of the same. 304.
21. How Baronius revileth Theodora the Emperesse, and a refutation of the same. 317.
22. How Baronius declameth against the Cause it selfe of the Three Chapter, and a refutation of the same. 333.
23. How Baronius revileth both the Imperiall Edict of Iustinian, and Theodorus Bishop of Cesarea, and a refutation of the same. 363.
24. How Baronius carpeth at the Synodall Acts of the first Council, as corrupted, and a refutation in generall of the same. 377.
25. The 1. Alteration of the Synodall Acts pretended by Baronius, For that the Text of the Councell at Chalcedon is changed therein, refuted. 381.
26. The 2. Alteration of the Synodall Acts pretended by Baronius, For that Ibas is said therein to have denied the Epistle written to Maris to be his, refuted. 386.
27. The 3. Alteration of the Synodall Acts pretended by Baronius, For that the Councell of Chalcedon is said therein to condemne the Epistle of Ibas, refuted. 389.
28. The Three first Defects in the Synodall Acts pretended by Baronius; For that the Acts against the Origenists, The Edict of Iustinian, And his Epistle touching that cause, are wanting therein, refuted. 391.
29. The 4. Defect in the Synodall Acts pretended by Baronius, For that the Emperours Epistle to the first Councell is wanting therein, refuted. 398.
30. The 5. Defect in the Synodall Acts pretended by Baronius, For that the Constitution of Pope Vigilius, concerning the Three Chapters is wanting therein, refuted, 399.
31. The 6. Defect in the Synodall Acts pretended by Baronius, For that the Decree which advanced Ierusalem to a Patriarchall dignity is wanting therein, refuted. 403.







# A TREATISE OF THE FIFT GENERALL COVNCILL

held at *Constantinople* under *Iustinian*, in  
the time of Pope *Vigilius*: Wherein the exceeding  
fraud and fallhoods of Cardinall *Baronius*  
are clearely discovered.

## CAP. II.

*That the Emperour IUSTINIAN assembled the Fift Generall Coun-  
cill, to define a doubt of Faith, about The three Chapters.*

**C**ONCILIA generalia mea sunt; primum, alti-  
mum, media, hinc their Romane & *Thraso*,  
Generall Councils are all ours, the first, the  
last, & the middle: *alls mine*, as said the De-  
vill to the Collier. A vaunt too vaine, too  
Thrafonticall. Divide the Councils aright,  
and let each have his own due part and por-  
tion, and then all the five first, and so much as they account the  
fixt, that is, all which were held for 600. yeares and more; All  
the golden Councils, and of the golden ages of the Church, are  
ours onely, and not theirs, in many and even in the maine points  
of Religion, repugnant to them and their doctrines: but in every  
Decree, Canon, and Constitution of faith, so consonant to us,  
that we not onely embrace, but earnestly defend them all, as  
the rightfull and proper inheritance left unto us by those holy  
Fathers of the ancient and Catholike Church. The middle  
ranke, beginning at the second *Nicene*, unto the Council of  
*Florence*, which were held in those ages of the mingled and con-  
fused Church, none of them are either wholly ours or wholly  
theirs, those miscellane Councils, are neither thine nor mine;  
but they must all be divided. The two last, the one at *Laterane*,  
the other at *Trent*, which are the very lees and dreggs of Coun-  
cills, held onely by such as were the drosse of the Church quite  
severed from the gold, wee willingly yeeld unto them: they and  
they onely are wholly theirs, let them have, let them enjoy their  
*Helenaes*, we envy not such refuse Councils unto them.

2. When first I set my selfe to the handling of this argument

concerning the Councils, it was my purpose, besides those other generall questions, concerning the right of calling generall Councils, the right of Presidencie in them, and the right of confirming them, to have made manifest those three severall points, touching those three ranks of Councils, every one of which, is not onely true, but even demonstrable in it selfe. And though with a delightfull kind of toile I have made no small progresse therein, yet alas, how unequal am I to such an *Herculean* labour; whose time, whose strength of body, or industry of minde, is able to accomplish a worke of such amplitude, and of so vast extent, for which not *Nestors* age would suffice. Wherefore turning my sailes, from this so long, and tedious a voyage, which I could not so much as hope to end, & which beside many dangerous rockes, hidden Syrtes and sands, is every where beset by many Romane enemies, specially by *Baronius* the Archpirate of this and former ages, with whom at every turne, almost, one shall be sure to have an hot encounter; I thought a shorter course far more fit, for my small and unfurnisht barke, and despairing of more or longer voyages, I shall be glad if God will enable me to make but a cut onely over some one arme of that great Ocean, not doubting but the ice being once broken, and the passage through these straits opened, many other will with more facilitie, and felicitie also, performe the like in the rest, untill the whole journey, through every part of these seas be at length fully accomplished.

3. Among all the Councils I have for sundry reasons made choice of the fift, held at *Constantinople* in the time of the Emperour *Justinian* and Pope *Vigilius*, for authoritie equal to the former, it being, as well as they, approved by the consenting judgement of the Catholike Church; for antiquitie venerable, being held within 600. yeares after Christ, even in those times while as yet the drosse had not prevailed and got the predominancie above the gold, as in the second *Nicene* Synod and succeeding ages it did: for varietie of weighty and important matters, more delightfull then any of the rest; and, which I most respected of them all, most apt to make manifest the truth and true Iudgement of the ancient and Catholike Church touching those Controversies of the Popes supremacy of authority and infallibility of judgement, which are of all other most ventilated in these dayes.

4. The occasion of this Council were those *Tria capitula*, as they were called, which bred exceeding much and long trouble to the whole Church: to wit, The person and writings of *Theodorus B. of Mopsuestia* long before dead the writings of *Theodoret B. of Cyrus* against *Cyril*: and the Epistle of *Ibas B. of Edessa* unto *Maris*: all which three Chapters were mentioned in the Council at *Chalcedon*.

b *AN.* 8, 9, 10.

5. The *Nestorians* (whose heresie was condemned in the third generall Council) when they could no longer under the name of



of *Nestorius* countenance their heresie, very subtilly indeavored to revive the same, by commending *Theodorus B. of Mopsuestia* and his writings, as also the writings of *Theodoret* against *Cyrill* and the Epistle of *Ibas* unto *Maris*. This after the Council of *Chalcedon* they more earnestly applied, then before, pretending that not onely the persons of *Theodoret* and *Ibas* (who both had sometimes beene very earnest for *Nestorius* and his heresies) but that the writings also of *Theodoret* and the Epistle of *Ibas*, which is full fraught with *Nestorianisme*, and wherein *Theodorus* with his hereticall writings are greatly extolled, were received and approved in that famous Council. And in truth the *Nestorians* little lesse then triumphed herein, and insulted over *Catholikes*, thinking by this meanes either to disgrace and utterly overthrow the Council of *Chalcedon*, if their doctrine were rejected, or, if that Council were embraced, together with it, and under the colour and authoritie of it, to renew and establish the doctrine of *Nestorius*, which (as they boasted) that council had certainly confirmed, by their approving that Epistle of *Ibas*.

6. By occasion hereof, many who were weake in faith began to doubt of the credit and authority of that most holy council: and those, as *Leontius* sheweth, were called *Hesitantes*, waverers or Doubters: Many others (who for other causes distastied that Council) were hereby encouraged pertinaciously to reject the same, as *Liberatus* declareth. Such were the *Agnostes*, *Gnostes*, *Theodosians*, *Themistians*; and other like Sectaries, called all by the common name of *Acephali*, because they had no one head by whom to be directed. All these, though being at mortall wars one with another, yet herein conspired to oppugne the faith, and the holy Council of *Chalcedon*, taking now advantage of that which the *Nestorians* every where boasted, and these men gladly beleaved, that in it the Epistle of *Ibas* (which maintaineth all the blasphemies of *Nestorius*) was approved. Thus the Church was by contrary enemies, on every side assailed, and so extremely disturbed, that as the Emperor testifieth, it was in a manner rent even from East to West, yea the East was rent from the West.

7. *Iustinian* the religious Emperor, knowing how much it was available not onely for his honor, and the tranquillitie of his empire, but for the good of the whole Church, and glory of God, to appease all those broiles: and knowing further, that the holy Council of *Chalcedon*, though it received the persons of *Theodoret* and *Ibas*, after that they had publickly renounced the heresie of *Nestorius*, yet, did utterly condemne both that Impious Epistle of *Ibas*, as also the person and doctrines of *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia* (both which that Epistle defendeth) together with the writings of *Theodoret* against *Cyrill*: he knowing and that ex-

c Nestorij sequace, propriam impietatem applicare volentes sancte Dei Ecclesiam & non potentes donec per Nestorij facere, festinaverunt eam introducere per Theodorum Mopsuesticum, necnon per impia scripta Theodoret, & per sceleratam Epistolam que dicitur Ibas ad Marinum. Iust. Ep. ad Synod. Col. 1. pa. 510. b. 127 habet: concilium ipsum in sua sententia definitiva. Col. 8 pa. 584. & Lib. c. 10 d Theodori et Nestorij sequaces conantur dicere susceptam esse eam (Epistolam Ibas) a Chalcedonensi Conc. nomine ejus Theodorum & Nestorium condemnatione liberare festinantes. Iust. Edict. S. Tali. Et iterum Epist. Iust. ad Synod. Col. 1. pa. 510. b. Et Dicebant istam impiam Epistolam que laudat et defendit Theodorum et Nestorium et eorum impietatem susceptam esse a Synodo Chalcedonensi. Col. 8 pa. 585. b. c Lib. de sect. act. 8. § Illi (Acephali) hoc offenduntur in Syn. Chalced quod laudes suscepit Theodori Mopsuest. Epistolam que Ibas, que per omnia Nestoriana esse cognoscitur. Lib. Brev. ca. 24. g Sacerdotes sanctorum Dei Ecclesiarum ab Oriente usque ad Occidentem admissi, fass. Epist. ad Synod. pa. 510. b. h Ob tria Capitula inter se iniquam tam in oriente quam in occidenti fides fuerant scisse atque schismate separati. Bar. an. 547. nu. 10.

Varius fere orbis occidentalis ab orientali ecclesia divisus erat. Bin. not. in 5. Conc. S. Constantin. Initium et fundam.



l. Extat apud Din.  
1000. 2. Conc. pa.  
492.

1 Si quis defendit  
Theodorum, &c. a-  
nathema sit. Edit.  
pa. 496.

actly all these particulars, that he might draw all the subjects of his Empire to the unitie of that most holy faith which was decreed at *Chalcedon*, set forth an<sup>k</sup> Imperiall Edict containing a most orthodoxall, religious and holy profession, or rather an ample Declaration of his, nay not his, but of the Catholike Faith. Among many other things, the Emperor in that Edict did particularly and expressely condemne *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia* with his doctrines, the writings of *Theodoret* against *Cyril*, and that most impious Epistle of *Ibas*, accursing<sup>l</sup> all these as hereticall, and all those, who either had heretofore, or should thereafter maintaine or defend them, or any one of them.

8. But notwithstanding all this, which the Emperor with great prudence, piety and zeale performed, very many, even some of those who bare the names of orthodoxall and Catholike Bishops, were so far from consenting to this Imperiall Edict, and the Catholike truth delivered therein, that they openly opugned his Edict, and defended the Three Chapters (by him condemned and anathematized) by words, by writings, by all meanes which they could devise, publishing libels and bitter invectives against it and the Emperor himselfe also. He seeing so generall a disturbance in his Empire, and the whole Church to be in a combustion about this cause, to end and quiet all, used that which is the best and last publick meanes which is left to the Church for deciding any doubt or controversie of faith, and of purpose to determine this so weighty a cause (whether those Three Chapters were to be condemned or allowed) he assembled this fifth and holy generall Council, whereof, God assisting us, we are now to entreat.

## CAP. II.

That the Fifth Generall Council, when Pope Vigilius refused to come unto it, was held without the Popes presence therein, either by himselfe or by his Legates.



That this Council was celebrated when Pope Vigilius was at Constantinople; that he was once, againe, often and earnestly, invited to the Synod, but wilfully refused to be present either personally or by his deputies, the Acts of the Council doe abundantly witness. The holy Synod said thus, *Sapius petivimus. We have often entreated the most holy Pope Vigilius; to come together with us and make a determination of these matters.* Again, the holy Synod said, *The most glorious Iudges and certaine of us (sapius adhortati sunt Vigilium) have often exhorted Vigilius, to come and debate and make an end of this cause touching the Three Chapters.* Neither did they onely invite, exhort, and entreat him; but in the Emperors name they commanded him to come to the Synod: *We being present*

a col. 2. pa. 924. a.

b col. 1. pa. 521. b.

c col. 2. pa. 524. b.

present (said the Bishops, who were sent unto him) *Liberius, Peter, and Patricius, proposuerunt Iussione[m] pijsimi Imperatoris sanctissimo Papa, proposuit* the most holy Pope *Vigilius* the command of the most holy Emperor. If all this seeme not enough, the Emperor himselfe testifieth<sup>a</sup> the same, *Mandavimus illi, we have commanded Vigilius, both by our Iudges, and by certaine of your selves* (he writ this to the Synod) *ut una cum omnibus conveniret, that he should come together with all the rest, in common to debate and determine this cause touching the Three Chapters.*

<sup>c</sup> Coll. 2. p. 524. d.

<sup>d</sup> Epist. In fin. ad Conc. Coll. 1. p. 520. d.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 5. § Coacta.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. eod. 19. § Adde.

<sup>g</sup> Notis in Conc. gen. 5. § Praefatis.

<sup>h</sup> Anno 553. nu. 29.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. nu. 31.

2. What Pope *Vigilius* did, after so many invitations, entreaties, and commands, *Card. Bellarmine* doth declare, The Pope, saith he, *neq[ue] per se, neq[ue] per legatos interfuit, was not present in the Council either by himselfe, or by his legats.* And more clearly in another place, The Pope, saith he, *was then at Constantinople, sed noluit interesse, but he would not be present in the Council.* *Binius* testifieth<sup>g</sup> the same. At the fifth Council *Vigilius* was not present either by himselfe or by his deputies. And *Baronius*, The Pope (saith he) *noluit interesse, would not be present either by himselfe, or by any to supply his place.* And this Cardinall adds<sup>i</sup> not without some choler, *The members assembled without the head, nulla Vigilijs agrotantis adhuc habita ratione, having no regard at all to Pope Vigilius then sick.*

3. What<sup>h</sup> doth the Card. complaine that they had no regard of him, when himselfe a little before professeth, *noluit interesse, he himselfe was not willing to be present?* Or had they no regard of him when before ever they assembled or sate in the Synod, they writ an Epistle<sup>k</sup> unto him entreating his presence, and with their own request, signified<sup>l</sup> the Emperors command, wil, and pleasure to him, that he shold come together with the rest? when after they were assembled in the Synod, they so often, so earnestly invited, and even entreated him to come together with them? when they whom they sent to invite him were no meane, no ordinary messengers neither for their number nor dignitie, but twenty reverend Bishops, all of them *Metropolitans*, as the Cardinal<sup>m</sup> both knew, and acknowledged, & the Synodall acts<sup>n</sup> doe witnesse, and of those twenty, three were *Patriarks*, *Eutychius*, of *Constantinople*, *Apollinaris*, of *Alexandria*, and *Domnus*, of *Antioch*? Was this a signe that they had no regard of *Vigilius*? when besides all this, in token of their most earnest desire of his presence, among divers other they proposed two most effectuell reasons to induce him to come. The one, the promise of Presidencie among them, which so far as in them lay, they offered unto him, saying, *Petimus presidente nobis vestra beatitudine, we entreat that your holinesse being present in this Synod, the question may be debated and have an end:* The other (which should not onely in equitie, but even in common honesty have prevailed with a Pope) for that himselfe had promised and that under his owne hand-writing, that he would come to the Synod: we told him (said the Bishop) *your holinesse knoweth,*

<sup>k</sup> Epist. Eutychij ad Vigilium loca Coll. 1. ideoq[ue] missa ante inchoatum Synodum. <sup>l</sup> Ut primo die instantis Maij pervenimus ad Vigilium: — Diximus, Pijssimus Dominus vult te una cum alijs convenire: proposuerunt iussione[m] pijsimi Imperatoris. Coll. 2. p. 523. b. 524. a. Concilium vero caput 4. die Maij. Coll. 1. <sup>m</sup> Missi sunt qui cum vocarent Episcopos numero viginti, ydemq[ue] Metropolitani. Bar. an. 553. nu. 35. <sup>n</sup> Coll. 1. & 2. nam in utraq[ue] missi sunt. <sup>o</sup> Coll. 1. p. 521. a.

<sup>p</sup> Coll. 2. p. 523. b.

quod in his qua inter nos in scriptis facta sunt, promissisti; that in those things which were done in writing betwixt us, you have promised to come together with the rest and discusse these three Chapters. And againe, we entreated his reverence (say the whole Synod) *scriptas suas promissiones adimplere*; to performe that which in his writing he had promised.

4. Had they no regard of sick Vigilius, whose infirmity being signified to the Synod at their first session, they forthwith concluded that Session, saying, *Oportet*, we must defer the examination of the cause to another day? And whereas the Pope promised to give them an answer the next day, then because his qualme was overpast, he found new excuses for his absence: one because there was but a few westerne Bishops then present with them; another because he would himself alone declare his judgement in writing, and offer it to the Emperor, for which cause he had entreated respite for certaine dayes of his highnesse. Both which were in truth nothing else but meere pretences, as the Bishops themselves, manifestly declared unto him. For both the Emperor, said they, *vult te in comuni convenire*; will have you to come together with the rest, & therefore he ought not to have given his sentence alone but in common and in the Synod: and for his other excuse, *Baronius* himselfe doubteth not to call that a pretence: for so it was indeed, seeing as the Bishops truly told him, in none of the former Councils there was any multitude of Westerne Bishops, but onely two or three, and some Clerkes, whereas at that time, there were present with the Pope at Constantinople many Italian Bishops, others out of Africk, others out of Illirium, for their number more then had beene in al the foure former Councils; whereupon they plainly and truly told the Pope to his face, *Nihil est quod prohibet vos convenire una nobiscum*; there is no sufficient or allowable cause to stay you from comming to the Synod together with us: not sicknesse, not want of Western Bishops, *Nihil est*, there is nothing else at all but an unwilling mind. So extraordinary respect had they of the Pope at this time, and so earnest were they to have him present in the Synod, of whom *Baronius* without any regard of truth shamed not to say, that they assembled having no respect at all unto sick Vigilius.

5. The true reason which made the Pope so unwilling to be present in the Synod, and why *Noluit interesse*, was indeed his hereticall affection and adversnes from the truth in this cause of the Three Chapters. He saw the Catholike Bishops, then assembled, to be bent and forward (as their dutie was) for condemning those Chapters, which himselfe embraced and defended: he therefore thought it fit to separate himselfe from them in place, from whom in judgement and in the doctrine of faith he was so farre disjoyned and severed. This to have beene the onely true cause of his wilfull absence and of his *Noluit interesse* the sequell of this Treatise will make most evident. For this time it is sufficient, by all those honorable invitations, earnest perswasions,

q Coll. 8. pa. 384. a

r Coll. 1. in fine.

s Postero die pollicitus est manifestare, quod ei de tali conventu placuerit. Coll. 1.

t Ille respondit non posse nobiscum convenire, eo quod plurimi quidam hic sunt Orientales Episcopi, pauci vero cum eo. Coll. 2. pa. 323. a.

v Dicebat facere se per semetipsum in scriptis, & offerre Imperatori, ideo enim & inducias se postulasse ab eius serenitate. Ibid.

x Eam sua absentia causam ratemissa. an. 553. nn. 36.

y Nec in saecula 4. Synodis multitudo Occidentalium Episcoporum inventa est unquam, sed duo vel tres Episcopi. Col. 2. pa. 323. b.

z Nunc vero adsunt multi ex Italia Episcopi, sunt etiam ex Africa, & ex Illyrico. Ibid.

a Ibid. Col. 2.



ons, and Imperiall commands, to have declared that as the holy Synod for their part was most desirous of his presence, so he not onely was absent, but in meere stomacke, wilfulnesse and perversnesse, absented himselfe from the Holy Councill at this time.

CAP. III.

That Pope VIGILIUS, during the time of the first Councill, published his Apostolicall Constitution in defence of the Three Chapters.

1.



Hen Pope *Vigilius* remaining then at *Constantinople* where the Councill was held, by no intreaties, perswasions nor Imperiall commands could be brought to the Synod, having no other let, as before was declared, but his owne wilfulnesse, the holy Synod re-

solved<sup>a</sup> without him to debate and judge the Controversie then referred unto them. And in truth what else was to be done in that case? The Emperour commanded<sup>b</sup> them not to delay nor protract the time, but deliver a speedy, yet withall a sound and true judgement in that cause. The necessity of the Church required this, which was now in a general<sup>c</sup> tumult and Schisme about those *Three Chapters*. The *Nestorians* on one side triumphed as if the Councill of *Chalcedon* had approved the Epistle of *Ibas*, and thereby confirmed their heresies. The *Acephali* on another side rejected that Councill, as favoring the *Nestorians* by approving that impious Epistle. The wavering *Hesitantes* were in a maze, not knowing which way to turne themselves, whether allow the Councill of *Chalcedon* with the *Nestorians*, or with the *Acephali* reject it. The Catholikes against all these Sectaries, both defended the Councill of *Chalcedon*, and yet rejected that impious Epistle and the *two other Chapters*. In such a generall rent and contention of all sides, what delay could the Church endure? which the Councill rightly considering,<sup>d</sup> said, That it was not just nor fit by delaying their judgement, to suffer either the Emperour or the faithful people any longer to be scandalized. And for the absence of *Vigilius*, they knew right well that which Card. *Cusanus* very truly observeth,<sup>e</sup> that if the Pope, being invited, did not, or would not come, or send to a Synod, but wilfully refused to come, in this case the Councill without him must provide for the peace of the Church and safety of the Christian faith. They had a very memorable example hereof, as yet but fresh before their eyes, when the Popes legats being present at *Chalcedon* were<sup>f</sup> invited and intreated to be present at the Synod there held (which was the very next before this) at the debating of the right and preeminence of the Sea of *Constantinople* but wilfully refused to be

a *Des juvenile, futuro die conveniet, qui oportet agemus. Col. 2. in fine*  
b *Celeriter de his qua interrogavimus vestram manifestate voluntatem. Iust. ep. ad Synod. Col. 1. pa. 520. b.*  
c *Ob tria capitula fideles fuerunt scissi atque schismate se parati. Bar. an. 547. nu. 29.*

d *Nec enim justum est vel Imperatorem vel fidele populum ex dilatione scandalizari. Co. 2. p. 533. b.*  
e *Alioquin si expellatur non mitteret, vel non veniret, vel nollet, Concilium congregatum suum necessitati, & Ecclesie salutis providenda debet. lib. 2. de Conc. ord. Cast. cap. 2.*  
f *Rogavimus dominos Episcopos de Roma, ut communicarent ijs gestis. Conc. Chalc. act. 16. pa. 134. a.*

be



g Ibid.

h *Viri illustrissimi  
Iudices dixerunt;  
quod interlocuti su-  
mus tota Synodus  
approbavit. Ibid. pa.  
137. b.*

i Ibid. pa. 140. a.

e *Cum nos per om-  
nia, quod decet, &  
servavimus & ser-  
vamus, & sapimus  
petroium Vigilium.  
Col. 2. pa. 324. a.*

l *Pa. eadem. b.  
m 1 Pet. 3. 15.*

n *Incongruum autē  
Sacerdotibus esse  
putantes provocare  
dandum a nobis re-  
sponsum Christianis-  
simo Imperatori. pa.  
eadem.*

o *Vigiliū libellus ob-  
latus Synodo. Bar.  
an. 553. nu. 47.  
p Ibid.*

be there, saying & (as *Vigilius* now did) *Non, sed alia se suscepisse mandata; No, we will not come, we have a contrary command from pope Leo*, yet that holy Council of *Chalcedon* handled and defined that cause in their absence, and their determination, notwithstanding the Popes absence, was not onely declared <sup>h</sup> by the most glorious Iudges to be just and Synodall, but the same was both by that holy *Synod*, and all other ever since, held to be the judgement and definition of the whole generall Council: for in their Synodal relation to the Pope, speaking of this very decree, they say, <sup>i</sup> *Confirmavimus ante, we* (to wit, this whole generall Council) *have confirmed the sentence of the 150. Bishops for the prerogative of Constantinople.* A most cleare and undeniable demonstration, and that by the warrant of one of the most famous Councils that ever were, that the peevishnes, perversnes, or wilfull absence of one or a few Bishops, yea of the Pope himselfe, ought not, nor could not hinder a Synod to judge and determine any needful cause; much lesse a cause of faith about which there should happen (as now there did) a general disturbance of the whole Church. Vpon these and other like reasons the holy Synod now assembled at *Constantinople*, having done as much as in them lay, yea, as <sup>k</sup> much in all points as was fit to be done for procuring the presence of *Vigilius*, and having in their first and second Sessions done nothing but waited and expected for his coming; seeing now all their invitations and intreaties to be contemned by him, and their longer expectance to be but in vaine, addresse themselves to the examining of the cause, being stird <sup>l</sup> up by the words of St. <sup>m</sup> *Peter, Be ready alwaies to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of your hope*, which readinesse if it must be in al Christians, much <sup>n</sup> more in Bishops: and if it must be declared towards all men, most of all towards the Emperor, who now required their speedy judgement and Synodall resolution in this cause.

2. Having in their first and second Sessions declared their long and earnest, but vaine expectance of *Vigilius*, In their third *Collation* (so their Sessions are called) they set downe as a foundation to all their future acts, a most holy confession of their faith, consonant in all points to that which the holy Apostles preached, which the foure former Councils explained, and which the Holy Fathers with uniforme consent maintained.

3. In the 4. and 5. *Collations*, they at large and very exactly discusse the first Chapter, concerning the person and writings of *Theodorus B. of Mopsuestia*, adding so much also as was needfull touching the second Chapter, which concerned the writings of *Theodoret* against *Cyrl*.

4. Now in that fifth *Collation*, as *Baronius* tells<sup>o</sup> us, the Constitution of Pope *Vigilius* touching the Three Chapters was brought unto the Synod. The Pope promised <sup>p</sup> that he would send his judgement thereof, *ad ipsum Imperatorem, atq. ad Synodum; both to the Emperor, and to the Synod*; which he ingenuously per-

performed; yea <sup>1</sup>, *modo opportunè præstandum putavit*, he did it opportunely at this very time of the 5. Collation: And the Card. is so resolute in this point, 'that he peremptorily affirmeth of the Popes Constitution, *Cognoscitur*;' it is knowne to pertaine to this very day of their fixt Collation: and it was this day offered to the Council: for which cause he strongly imagining this Constitution to be stolne out of the Synodall acts now extant, is bold to insert it into the 5. Collation; as into his owne due and proper place, wherein it was, and now ought to be.

5. The Card. is too confident about the day when it was sent to the Synod, as also in his adding this Constitution to the Acts of the Synod, as hereafter in due place will appeare. Thus much is certaine and evident by the Synodall acts, that this Constitution of Vigilius was made knowne to the Bishops of this holy Council, before their fixt Collation, for in that fixt, divers things are expressed, which have a cleare and undoubted reference to the Popes decree, as containing a refutation of the same, and herein the Card. saith truly, The decree of Vigilius was first sent to the Emperor, and from him to the Synod, as by the fixt Collation may be perceived, wherein those things which the Pope had alledged for defence of the Epistle of Ibas, are refuted.

6. As for the dignity, credit and authority of this writing, it is neither any ordinary nor private instruction, but as the Pope himselfe calleth it, a Constitution, <sup>1</sup> a Statute, <sup>2</sup> a Decree, a Definition, <sup>3</sup> or Definitive sentence: and by the name of a Constitution, it is subscribed unto, both by the Pope <sup>4</sup> and all the rest of his Assemblies, and for such it is commended by Card. <sup>5</sup> Baronius and Binius <sup>6</sup>. In it the Pope delivereth his Apostolicall sentence & Iudgement touching the Three Chapters, this being <sup>7</sup> that very same answer which Vigilius promised to send to the Emperor, and for the advised setting downe whereof, he <sup>8</sup> requested of the Emperor the respite of twenty dayes. During which time he did *insudare* and *laborare*, as the Card. saith, <sup>9</sup> with much sweat and toile elaborate this large decree, (containing no lesse then thirty six columes *in folio*) that it might in every respect, and for the exact handling of so weighty a cause, be correspondent to the gravity and authority of his infallible Chaire, specially seeing he set it forth of purpose, that it might be notified <sup>10</sup> not onely to the Emperor and the Synod then assembled, *sed universo orbi Catholico, but to the whole Catholike Church*, as a publike direction in faith for them all; in which kinde of teaching, *nullo casu errare potest*, saith Card. Bellarmine, <sup>11</sup> the Pope can by no means be possibly deceived. For this cause also Vigilius at this time, and in this businesse, used the help and advice of a Synod, consisting of Italian, Africane, and Illyrian Bishops, then present with him at Constantinople, fixteene Bishops beside himselfe, and three Romane Deacons. These all consented with the Pope, and subscribed <sup>12</sup> to his Constitution; and in theirs was included the consent of the Africane, of the Illyrian, of the Italian, and other

q. An. eod. nu. 48

r. Ibid.

s. Anno eod. nu. 41.

t. Constitutum hoc ex actis 5. Synodi nescitur esse sublatum. an. eod. nu. 49.

v. Cum ad hunc ipsum annum et diem Collationis s. pervenire cognoscitur. Ibid. nu. 48.

x. An. 553. nu. 210.

y. Que presenti statimur (constituta. Vig. Const. apud Bar an. 553. nu. 208.

z. Statimur et decernimus. ibid.

a. Post presentem definitionem. ibid.

b. Vigilius Episcopus huic Constitutioni nostro subscripsi. ib. nu. 209.

c. Iohannes Marsennus huic Constitutioni subscripsi. Et alij similiter. ibid.

d. An. 553. nu. 47.

e. Vigily Pope Constitution. Binius in Fragm. 5. Conc. p. 595.

f. Hunc ipsum officias, quem de sua sententia interpellamus, pollicitus esse missurum ad Imperatorem. Bar. an. 553. nu. 47.

g. Const. Vigily. nu. 58.

h. An. 553. nu. 28.

i. Apud Bar. nu. 553 an. 50. ad 210.

k. Bar. an. 553. nu. 47.

l. Lib. 4. de Pont.

Num. ca. 3. § Sit.

m. Vide subscriptio. nu. loc. cit. nu. 209.

Western

n Occidentales per-  
siabant in sententia  
quæ semper fuerant  
pro trium defensione  
capitulorum. an. 547  
nu. 39.

o Vigilij Const. a-  
pud Bar. loc. cit. nu.  
209.

p In Sess. 1. Conc.  
Trid. Archiepiscopi  
& Episcopi non plu-  
res quam 26. ut ex  
actu liquet.

q Bar. an. 553. nu.  
48.  
r Ibidem.

s To. 2. pa. 591.

Westerne Churches, even of the Church of Rome also, who all at this time agreed in judgement about the *Three Chapters* with the Pope, as Card. Baronius professeth<sup>n</sup>. So deliberate and advised was the Pope in this cause, that his resolution herein is not onely a Pontificall, but a Synodall Sentence also, yea a Decree and definitive judgement delivered by the Pope, as himselfe expressly witnesseth, <sup>o</sup> *Ex autoritate sedis Apostolicæ*; by the authoritie of the Apostolicke See, an whole Synod of Bishops (the Westerne Churches consenting with them) subscribing to the same, for their number, well-neere<sup>p</sup> as many, as there were Bishops present in some Sessions of their Oecumenicall Council at Trent.

7. This Apostolicall Constitution, which had long laid in obscuritie, about some 18. yeares since was brought to light, and first<sup>q</sup> of all published by Card. Baronius to the open view of the world, copied by him out of an ancient<sup>r</sup> manuscript in their *Vaticane*, where still it is kept: and more then halfe of it, is set out by Binus<sup>s</sup>, annexed as a fragment to the fifth generall Council. But for what good purpose Binus clipt away the residue, being a great (no lesse then five or six columes in folio) and by farre the most needfull part of the Popes Decree, thereby not onely injuring the Popes Holines, and deluding the world, but foully maiming and disgracing his owne Tomes of the Councils, you will easily perceive hereafter.

8. The summe and effect of the Popes Constitution is the Defence of those *three Chapters*, which the Emperor by his most religious Edict had condemned and accursed. The Pope, saith Baronius<sup>t</sup>, during the time of the Synod, set forth *Decretum pro defensione trium Capitulorum*, his decree for defence of the *Three Chapters*. Again<sup>u</sup>, *Vigilius* made knowne to the whole Church *pro Tribus Capitulis Constitutum à se editum*, his Constitution published in defence of the *Three Chapters*. Again<sup>x</sup>, *pro ipsorum defensione laborat*, *Vigilius* labored for defence of the *Three Chapters*. But the Constitution it selfe maketh this most evident.

9. Concerning the first Chapter, whether *Theodorus* (being dead more then an hundred yeares before this Council) ought to be condemned, *Vigilius* thus decreed, *Nulli licere noviter aliquid de mortuorum judicare personis*, That it is not lawfull for any to judge ought anew of those persons who are dead, that is, not to condemne those, who, as *Vigilius* explaining himselfe saith, <sup>z</sup> *minime reperimur in vita damnati*, are not found to have bene condemned while they lived. This for the generality of the dead: particularly for *Theodorus B. of Mopsuestia* he thus decreed<sup>y</sup>, Seeing the holy Fathers had not, (as he saith) condemned him, *cum nostra non audeamus damnare sententia*, we dare not condemne him by our sentence, *sed nec ab alio quopiam condemnari concedimus*; neither doe we permit that any other shall condemne him.

10. For the second Chapter which concernes the writings of *Theodoret* against *Cyrril*, *Vigilius* was so tender of the credit of *Theodoret*, that he would by no meanes permit his name to be blemished

t An. 553. nu. 218.

u Ibid. nu. 218.

x Ibid. nu. 272.

y Vigilij Const. a-  
pud Bar. an. 553. nu.  
179.

z Ibid. nu. 176.

a Ibid. nu. 175.



blemished by condemning his writings, seeing as he saith, neither Cyril himself, nor after him the Council of Chalcedon had condemned them. Nay Vigilus further adds, *quod ita est valde contrarium et indubitanter inimicum, very contrary and undoubtedly repugnant to the judgement of the Council at Chalcedon, to condemn any Nestorian doctrines under the name of Theodoret.* Whereupon he definitively decreeth in this manner *Statuimus atque dicimus, we ordaine and decree that no injury or slander shall by any man be raised, or uttered against Theodoret, sub taxatione nominis ejus, by taxing of his name.* So Vigilus, decreting that the condemning of those writings of Theodoret against Cyril, is an injury to Theodoret.

b Ibid. nu. 181.

c Nu. 180.

d Nu. 182.

11. The third Chapter (which indeed is the most materiall, but withall most intricate and obscure) concerns the Epistle written against Cyril and the holy Ephesine Synod, by Ibas B. of Edessa unto Maris a Persian and an Hereticke: the copie whereof is set downe in the 15. Actiō of the Council at Chalcedon, and repeated in the 6. Collation of this fifth Council. What the Pope decrees herein, Baronius doth declare, who explaining the words and meaning of Vigilus, saith, *That the Fathers of Chalcedon, dixerunt eam Epistolam ut Catholicam recipiendam, said that this Epistle of Ibas was to be received as Catholike, and further adds, Ex ea Ibas comprobatur esse Catholicum, that by this Epistle Ibas himselfe was proved to be a Catholike, yea that he was so proved by the consenting judgement of all the Bishops at Chalcedon.* So Baronius

e Ann. 553. nu. 191

f Ibid. nu. 196.

g An. 448. nu. 71.

12. This to have beene indeed the true meaning of Pope Vigilus, his owne words in his Constitution make manifest. There he first sets downe the ground of his sentence, and that was the sayings of Pascasinus and Maximus in the Council at Chalcedon. The Popes legats said by Pascasinus, *Relata ejus epistola agnovimus eum orthodoxum, By the Epistle of Ibas now read, we acknowledge him to be orthodoxall.* Maximus said, *Ex relecta rescripto epistola, orthodoxa est ejus declarata dictatio, by the Epistle of Ibas now read, his Epistle or writing is declared to be orthodoxall.* Vigilus grounding himselfe on these two speeches, collecteth and sets downe two positions of his owne, concerning this third Chapter. The former, that the Council of Chalcedon approved that Epistle of Ibas as orthodoxall, to which purpose hee saith, *the Fathers of the Council at Chalcedon, Epistolam pronunciantes orthodoxam, pronounced this Epistle to be orthodoxall: and yet more plainly, Orthodoxa est Ibas a patribus pronunciata dictatio, the Epistle or writing of Ibas was pronounced orthodoxall by the Fathers at Chalcedon.* The other, that by this Epistle they judged Ibas to be a Catholike, to which purpose Vigilus writeth thus, *Tuentalis would never have said that Ibas was a Catholike, nisi ex verbis epistole ejus confessionem fidei orthodoxam comprobaret.* Vales by the words of his Epistle he had proved his faith to be orthodoxall, which words evidently shew that Vigilus thought in like sort all the Bishops

h Const. Vigil. loco citato nu. 187.

i Ibid. nu. 189.

k Ibid. nu. 193.

l Ibid. nu. 193.



Bishops at *Chalcedon* to have judged the same by the words of that Epistle, for it is certaine that they all embraced *Ibas* himselfe for a Catholike.

m *Ibid.* nu. 196.

13. Hereupon now ensueth the *Definitive* sentence of *Vigilius* touching this Chapter, in this manner: "We following the judgement of the holy Fathers in all things, seeing it is a most cleare and shining truth, *ex verbis Epistolæ venerabilis Ibas*, by the words of the Epistle of the reverend B. *Ibas*, being taken in their most right and godly sense, and by the acts of *Photinus* and *Eustathius*, and by the meaning of *Ibas* being present, that the Fathers at *Chalcedon* did most justly pronounce the faith of this most reverend Bishop *Ibas* to be orthodoxall, we decree by the authoritie of this our present sentence, that the Iudgement of the Fathers at *Chalcedon* ought to remaine inviolable, both in all other things, and in this Epistle of *Ibas* so often mentioned. Thus *Vigilius*: decreeing both that this Epistle of *Ibas* is Catholike, & that by it & by the words thereof, *Ibas* ought to be judged a Catholike, both which he decreeth upon this ground, that the Council of *Chalcedon* (as he supposeth) had judged the same.

n *Ibid.* nu. 208.

14. In the end, to ratifie and confirme all that concernes any of these *Three Chapters* in the Popes Decree, he addeth this very remarkable conclusion. "His igitur à nobis cum omni undique cautela ac diligentia dispositis, These things being now with all diligence, care and circumspection disposed, Statuimus et decernimus, we ordaine and decree, that it shall be lawfull for none pertaining to Orders and ecclesiasticall dignities, either to write, or speake, or teach any thing touching these *three Chapters*, contrary to these things which by this our present Constitution we have taught and decreed: aut aliquam post præsentem definitionem movere ulterius questionem, neither shall it be lawfull for any, after this our present definition, to move any question touching these *Three Chapters*. But if any thing concerning these Chapters be either done, said, or written, or shall hereafter be done, said, or written contrary to that which we have here taught and decreed, hoc modis omnibus ex auctoritate sedis Apostolicæ refutamus; we by all meanes do reject it by the Authority of the Apostolike See, whereof by Gods grace we have now the government. So *Vigilius*.

15. Thinke ye not now, that any Papist considering this so advised, elaborate and Apostolicall decree of Pope *Vigilius*, will be of opinion that there was now a finall end of this matter, and that all doubt concerning these *Three Chapters* was for ever now removed: seeing the *supreme Iudge* had published for a direction to the whole Church his definitive, Apostolicall, and infallible sentence in this cause, what needeth the Council either to judge, or so much as debate this matter after this Decree? To define the same was needlesse, more then to light a candle when the Sunne shineth in his strength. To define the contrary, were *Hereticall*: yea after such an authenticall decision and determination

tion, to be doubtfull<sup>o</sup> onely what to beleeeve, hath the censure of an Infidell. But thrice happy was it for the Church of God, that this doctrine of the Popes supreme authoritie and infallible Iudgement, was not then either knowne or beleeeved. Had it beene, the *Nestorians* and their heresie had for ever prevailed, the Catholike faith had beene utterly extinguished, and that without all hope or possibility ever after this to have beene revived; seeing *Vigilius* by his *Apostolicall* authoritie had stopt all mens mouths from speaking, tyed their hands from writing, yea and their very hearts from beleeeving or thinking ought contrary to his *Constitution* made in defence of the *Three Chapters*, wherein he hath confirmed all the Blasphemies of *Nestorius*, and that by a Decree more irrevocable then those of the *Medes* and *Persians*. Had the holy Council, at that time assembled, beleeeved or knowne that doctrine of the Popes supremacie and infallible Iudgement, they would not have proceeded one inch further in that businesse, but shaking hands with Heretickes, they and the whole Church with them, had beene led in triumph by the *Nestorians* at that time, under the conduct of Pope *Vigilius*.

*o Dubius in fide infidelis est. lib. 5. De c. tit. 7. de hereticis.*

16. And by this you may conjecture that *Binius* had great reason to conceale the later part of the Popes decree, for he might well thinke, as any papist will, that it were a foule incongruitie to set downe three intire Sessions of an holy and generall Council, not onely debating this controversie of faith about the *Three Chapters*, but directly also contradicting the Popes definitive sentence in them all, notwithstanding they knew the Pope by his *Apostolicall* authoritie to have delivered his Iudgement, and by the same authoritie to have forbidden all men either to write, or speak, or to move any doubt to the contrary, of that which he had now decreed. But let us see by a view of the particulars and of their following Sessions, how this Cathedrall sentence of the Pope was entertained by the holy generall Council.

## CAP. 4.

That the holy generall Council in their Synodall Iudgement contradicted the Popes Apostolicall Constitution and definitive sentence, in that cause of faith, made knowne unto them.

1.



In the sixt, which was the very next Sessions after they had knowne the Popes will and pleasure, contrary to the Apostolicall authoritie and command of *Vigilius*, the Holy Synod began to examine the Epistle of *Ibas*: for the causes of *Theodorus* and of *Theodore* were sufficiently discussed in their former *Collations*. And

first of all, alledging a saying of the Emperour (to which themselves doe assent) they thus say, which being well observed gives light to the whole cause and openeth both the error of *Vigilius* and the ground thereof. Because <sup>a</sup> the most holy Emperour added among those things which he writ unto us, that some endeavouring to defend the Epistle of *Ibas*, presume to say that it was approved by the holy Council of *Chalcedon*, using the words of one or two most religious Bishops, who were in that Council, as spoken for that Epistle, cum alijs omnibus, whereas all the rest were of another minde, we thinke it needfull, this question being proposed, to recite the Epistle of *Ibas*. Thus said the Synod, even at the first, calling the Popes judgement Presumption, and checking him both for pretending the Council of *Chalcedon*, and for alledging the *Interlocutions* of one or two, as the Iudgement of that Council. For, that the whole Synod consented to that speech of the Emperour, appeareth both by their owne words, where they shew this to be so odious an untruth, that they all cried out against it, saying, <sup>b</sup> The Decree of the Council at *Chalcedon* condemneth this Epistle, hee that receiveth this Epistle rejecteth the Council at *Chalcedon*: and, by those speeches of *Theodorus* Bishop of *Cesarea*, *Andreas* Bishop of *Ephesus*, and others, to which the whole <sup>c</sup> Synod assented, *Quomodo* <sup>d</sup> presumunt quidam dicere, How do any presume to say, that this impious Epistle of *Ibas* was approved by the Council of *Chalcedon*? And againe, *Miramur quomodo*, we doe even marvell that any will defend this Epistle by the name of the Council at *Chalcedon*: and yet more sharply reproving *Vigilius* with others, for using so deceitfull a prooffe, they adde, *Asutia enim haeretica nitentes*, for they (who so say of the Council at *Chalcedon*) using the fraud and subtiltie of heretickes, doe produce the *Interlocutions* of one or two, as spoken for that Epistle, whereas this is to be set downe for a certaine rule, that in Councils, non unius aut secundis interloquutionem attendere oportet, the speeches of one or two must not be attended, but what is defined by all, or by the greater

<sup>a</sup> Col. 6. pa. 361. a.

<sup>b</sup> Col. 6. pa. 376. b.

<sup>c</sup> Sancta Synodus dixit, Scimus et nos hoc ita consequuta esse. Col. 6. p. 364. a.  
<sup>d</sup> Col. 6. pa. 363. b.



ter part of the Council. And yet further expressing their dislike of that fallacious and sophisticall reason which *Vigilius* herein used, the whole Council said, The holy <sup>e</sup> Fathers at *Chalcedon* did, *pro nihilo habere, quia ab uno vel duobus pro eadem Epistola dicta sunt*, did esteeme as nothing, or made no reckning at all of those things which were spoken for that Epistle by one or two; And those one or two were *Pascasinus* and *Maximus*; on whose interlocutions the Pope, as you have formerly seene, grounded his decree, concerning this *Chapter*; and if the prooffe be of so small account by the judgement of that most holy Council, it inevitably followeth, that the *Decree* of *Vigilius* which wholly (for this *Chapter*) relyeth on this prooffe, is no better then the ground thereof, that is in very deed, worth nothing at all.

2. Now that all this is purposely spoken against *Vigilius* and his *Constitution* (which before this 6 *Collation* was made knowne unto them) beside that it is evident by the Acts themselves, seeing the Council doth exactly mention, and refuse all the principall points on which *Vigilius* doth insist, *Baronius* doth not onely professe, but truly, upon this reason, doth prove the same: for entreating of this 6. Session, and mentioning the contents thereof, *This was done*, saith he, <sup>d</sup> as is evident, against the *Constitution* of Pope *Vigilius* (although for reverence they doe not name him) and partly also they excuse him, partly they reprove him, using especially this argument, *Because in Councils we must not attend what one or two say, but what is defined by all or the most*. Thus *Baronius*, who as he truly acknowledge the Council herein to have dealt against *Vigilius* and his *Decree*; so in the other points, he bewrayes too great partialitie towards *Vigilius*, for the Council is so far from excusing the pope, that neither *Baronius* could, nor any of his friends shall be ever able to shew that excuse: And for their not naming of *Vigilius*, it proceeded not from any reverence they bare unto him (though in every respect they gave him all honour that was due to him, or his place) but the true reason thereof was this, because they neither did, nor thought it fit to name any one of those, whom they did condemne, but without mention of their names in particular, condemned them all under one generall Appellation of, *Sequaces Nestorij et Theodori*, the followers of *Nestorius* and *Theodorus*, their Disciples, or defenders which titles they saw the Emperour to have used and given unto them before, both in his Edict, and in his <sup>e</sup> Epistle to the Synod, which common names to have as fitly and truly agreed to Pope *Vigilius* as to any else, the Council knew right well, seeing in every point concerning these *Three Chapters*, he wholly agreed with them all. The <sup>h</sup> followers of *Theodorus* and *Nestorius* pretended, and presumed to say, that the Council of *Chalcedon* approved the Epistle of *Ibas*: *Vigilius* pretended, and presumed to say the same; The Fathers at *Chalcedon* (saith he) pronounced the Epistle of *Ibas* to be *Orthodoxall*. The followers

<sup>e</sup> Coll. 6. p. 576. a.

<sup>d</sup> An. 553. nu. 212.

<sup>e</sup> *Definitio Synod.*

Col. 8. pa. 586. a.

*Defensores Nestorij*

*& ejus impietatis,*

*Ibid. pa. 585. b.*

*Theodori discipuli.*

*Ibid. & supra alibi.*

<sup>f</sup> *Theodori & Nestorij sequaces.*

pa. 497. a.

<sup>g</sup> *Nestorij sequaces.*

pa. 519. b.

<sup>h</sup> *Theodori & Nestorij defensores dicebant, &c. Col. 8.*

pa. 585. b. *Es presumunt dicere, Col. 8.*

pa. 561. a. & Col. 8.

pa. 586. a.

<sup>i</sup> *Const. Vig. apud*

*Bar. an. 553. nu. 192*



<sup>k</sup> Col. 8. pa. 586. a. of *Theodorus* and *Nestorius* fraudulently used the *Interlocutions* of one or two, as the <sup>l</sup> Judgment of the whole Council at *Chalcedon*. *Vigilius* used the very same fraud, and for this very cause, as the *Cardinall* confesseth, is reprov'd by the Council. Seeing then, *Vigilius* did at this time, and in this cause, walke hand in hand, and step by step with the other followers of *Theodorus* and *Nestorius*; The holy Council judged it most fit and sufficient (as it was indeed) to refuse and condemne both him and his *Constitution*, by that common name which agreed to all the rest, with whom in one common doctrine, both for his position and proofes thereof, he fully conspired.

3. The holy Council having now fully discovered the error of the Popes position, and the fallacious proofe which he used to uphold the same, proceedeth to refute his very definitive sentence, proving that neither the Epistle of *Ibas* is to be received as Catholike, neither that by it *Ibas* was, or ought to be judged a Catholike, which were the two maine points of the Popes Decree touching this Chapter. For declaring both these, they diligently examined the whole Epistle, and found it in every part to be hereticall and blasphemous. But for the more cleare demonstration hereof, as also how untruly and unjustly *Vigilius*, and the other followers of *Nestorius* pretended, that it was received as orthodoxall by the Council at *Chalcedon*, they thought it not sufficient to lay open the severall impieties of that Epistle, considered by it selfe, but making a comparison or Collation betwixt it and the holy Council at *Chalcedon*, they set, in a direct opposition, the most holy and Catholike truths decreed at *Chalcedon*, against the blasphemous impieties and heresies contained in that Epistle of *Ibas*. The summe of which Collations, or of some of them, I will here briefly propose out of the Synodall acts, referring the Reader for the full notice of them all, to the Acts themselves, wherein they are at large, exactly, and excellently delivered.

<sup>m</sup> Col. 6. pa. 575. & seq.

4. I. The holy Council of *Chalcedon* professeth GOD to be incarnate, and made man: The Epistle calleth them *Hereticke*s and *Apollinarians*, who say that GOD was incarnate or made Man.

II. The holy Synod professeth the blessed *Virgin* to be the Mother of GOD: The Epistle denieth the *Virgin Mary* to be the Mother of GOD.

III. The holy Council embraced that forme of Faith which was declared in the first *Ephesine Synod*, and anathematizeth *Nestorius*: The Epistle defendeth *Nestorius*, injureth, nay rejecteth, the holy *Ephesine* Council, as if it had condemned *Nestorius* without due triall of his cause.

o Primam Ephesine Synodum reprobat hac Epistola, Col. 6. pa. 563. a. &

IV. The holy Council commendeth *Cyrill* of blessed memory, and approveth his Synodall Epistles, in one of which are contained those his 12. Chapters by which he condemned the heresie

*heresie of Nestorius*: The Epistle calleth *Cyrril* an *heretike*, and his 12. Chapters it tearmeth impious.

V. The Holy Councille professeth their faith to be the same with *Cyrril*, and accurseth those who beleeve otherwise: The Epistle faith of *Cyrril*, & those who beleeved as he did, that they were confounded, and reſanted their former doctrine.

VI. The holy Councille accurseth those, who either make, or deliver any other *Creed*, then that which was expounded at the great *Nicen Synod*: The Epistle doth extoll *Theodorus*, who besides innumerable blasphemies, made another *Creed*, wherein he teacheth the *Word of God* to be one person, and *Christ* another person, accursing all, who doe not embrace that his new *Creed*. This is that *Creed of Theodorus*, against which (being openly read before in the fourth *Collation*) the holy Councille exclaimed, saying, *the devill himſelfe composed this Creed: Cursed be he that composed this Creed: Cursed be all those that curse not the composer of this Creed.* Of this it is, that here they witnes, that the Epistle of *Ibas* praiseth and magnifieth the author and composer thereof. p Pa. 536. a.

VII. The holy Councille teacheth, that in *Christ* there are two distinct natures, yet but one person consisting of both: The Epistle teacheth, that as there are two natures, so also two persons in *Christ*, and that there is no personall, but onely an affectuall unitie of those two persons. Thus far hath the Synod opened, by way of comparison, the blasphemies of that Epistle, and the contrary truths decreed at *Chalcedon*.

5. Now although this *Collation* doth abundantly of it selfe manifest both the Impieties of that Epistle, of which *Vigilius* had decreed, that it ought to be received as *orthodoxall*: and how repugnant it is to the Councille of *Chalcedon*, of which *Vigilius* had decreed, that it was received as *orthodoxall*, by those holy Fathers, yet for more evidence of this truth, the holy Councille doth in plaine and expresse termes, expresse both these points: for after this comparison they said, *This our Collation, doth manifestly shew, quod contraria per omnia est Epistola definitioni; that this Epistle of Ibas is in all and every part thereof contrary to the definition of faith, which was made at Chalcedon.* And againe, *We all accurse this Epistle, who so doth not accurse this Epistle is an heretike; who so receiveth this Epistle is an heretike: who so receiveth this Epistle rejecteth the Councille of Chalcedon: who so receiveth this Epistle denieth God to be made man.* Thus said, and cryed out the whole Synod with one voice: accursing (as you plainly see) not onely the decree and definitive sentence of *Vigilius* as *hereticall*, but *Vigilius* himſelfe as an *heretike*, as a rejecter of the Councille of *Chalcedon*, as a denier that *God* was incarnate, or made man. q Col. 6. pa. 576. a.

6. Thinke ye not that the Councille was very unmannerly, daring not onely to talke and write of this Chapter, contrary to the Popes knowne will and pleasure, but even to condemne with one consent his sentence for *hereticall*, and himſelfe for an

heretike? *Binus* was exceeding loath to have it thought, that a generall, lawfull, ancient, and approved Council, had so directly contradicted the Popes Cathedrall judgement, and proclaimed to all the world the Pope to be an heretike, yea a definer of heresie, and that by his *Apostolicall* authoritie; and therefore he not knowing any better way to save the Popes credit, thoght it most fit to suppress and dash out that whole passage in the Popes *Constitution*, which bewrayeth this matter: *Deleatur*, let all that part of the *Constitution* of *Vigilius* be left out; though the omission thereof doth disgrace and maim my edition of the Councils, let the latter part of his *Apostolicall* sentence lye in obscuritie and never see the Sunne.

7. *Baronius*, who (to the eternall infamy of their Popes, of their *infallible* Chaire, and of their whole religion, which wholly relies thereon) first had the heart to publish this Hereticall decree of *Vigilius*, deviseth another medicine to salve this sore: But avoiding *Sylla* he fallerth into *Charybdis*, a worse gulfe then the other, plunging himselfe, with the Pope, in a condemned heresie. There are (as he could not but confesse) <sup>r</sup> *many blasphemies in that Epistle*, but none of those, saith he, did either the Council of *Chalcedon* or Pope *Vigilius* approve. What then, I pray you, was it, which his Holinesse defended, and approved therein? Forsooth in the end <sup>s</sup> of the Epistle, *Ibas* declareth that he assented to the covenants of *Vnion* betweene *Iohn* and *Cyryll*, *quæ recepta, necesse fuit eundem probare catholicum; which peace and union being embraced by Ibas, he must needs be acknowledged thereby to be a Catholike*. Seeing then, this is understood, and gathered out of it, that after the *Vnion*, *Ibas* was a Catholike, we may see, *ob id non esse explodendam epistolam, sed ad hoc quod dixi recipiendam, that for this cause the Epistle is not to be rejected, but to be received, for this purpose*, which I said, that by the end of it *Ibas* may be proved to be a Catholike. And the *Cardinall* labours to prove this by two testimonies, the one is that of *Pascasinus*, and the other legates of *Leo*: They (saith he) <sup>v</sup> spake not amisse, when they said, *Epistola illa lecta, Ibas probatum esse Catholicum*, that by that Epistle being read, *Ibas* was proved to be a Catholike: The other is that speech of *Eunomius* B. of *Nichomedia*, of whom he thus writeth, <sup>x</sup> *Hoc plane fuit*, this is cleerly that which *Eunomius* said, *ipsam Epistolam in principio apparere hereticam, in fine vero inventam esse Catholicam; that the Epistle of Ibas by the beginning seemeth to be hereticall, but by the end was found to be Catholike*. Thus *Baronius*, in defence of that most impious Epistle, which as he saith, by the end of it is found to be *orthodoxall* and catholike, and so to be received.

8. What is it to be an heretike, if this be not? Directly to contradict the judgement of an holy generall Council, and defend that writing or part of it to be Catholike, which in every part the whole Council hath defined to be hereticall? The whole Council



Council 7 with one voice proclaimed; *Tota Epistola haretica est, Tota Epistola blasphemica est, qui istam suscipit, hareticus est; The whole Epistle is heretical, and blasphemous, who so receiveth this Epistle* (either in the whole, or in any part, as themselves expressly as-  
firmed <sup>2)</sup> *he is an hereticke.*

7 *Hac omnes dicimus, &c. Col. 6. pa. 576. b.*

2 *Qui dicunt eam rectam esse vel partem ejus. Col. 8. pa. 587. b.*

Not so, saith the *Card.* It is not all hereticall, It is not all blasphemous: The latter part of it, is right, holy, and Catholike, by it *Ibas* was rightly judged to be a Catholike; That part, at least, is to be received and embraced, to declare *Ibas* to be a Catholike. Now though this alone were enough to refute whatsoever the *Cardinall* doth or can say in this cause, seeing it is all nothing else, but the saying, nay the cavilling of a convicted heretike, proclaimed for such by the loud cries of an ancient and holy generall Council, yet for the full manifesting of the truth, I will doe the *Cardinall* that favour, as to examine both his assertion, and the proofes thereof. And because I shall hereafter in due place have fit occasion at large (as the obscuritie and intricacy of this cause requireth) to discusse the words and declare the true meaning of *Ibas* in that part, which the *Cardinall* doth most wilfully and heretically mistake and pervert, for this time, I will use no other prooffe against him, but the cleere judgement and consenting testimony of the generall Council, which hath professedly refuted this very cavil, which *Baronius* borrowed from the ancient heretikes of those times. And I am verily perswaded, that *Baronius* would never, for very shame of the world, have used this so untrue, so hereticall, and withall a rejected evasion, but that he hoped that none would compare and examine his writings by the Acts of the Councils, or if they did, that the same and credit of *Cardinall Baronius* his name would countenance any untruth or Heresie against whatsoever opponents.

9. Is the end of the Epistle of *Ibas* Catholike? or doth that shew *Ibas* to bee a Catholike? The whole Council expressly witnesseth the contrary. Our <sup>a</sup> Collation (say they) <sup>a</sup> *Col. 6. pa. 576. a.* doth manifestly shew that this Epistle of *Ibas*, *contraria per omnia est Definitioni*; is in every part of it contrary to the Definition of faith made at Chalcedon. This whole Epistle is hereticall, and blasphemous. Again, Wee have demonstrated (say they) <sup>b</sup> this Epistle, *contrariam esse per omnia*; To be in every <sup>b</sup> *Col. 8. pa. 5.* part of it contrary to those things which are contained in the Definition of faith made at Chalcedon. Again, <sup>c</sup> *Tota epistola impietatis plena est*, the whole Epistle is full of impietie. <sup>c</sup> *Col. 6. pa. 564. a.* And more clearly to our purpose, and against this cavill of *Baronius*, they adde, <sup>d</sup> Those <sup>d</sup> *Ibid.* who say that the former part of this Epistle is impious, but the latter part or end thereof is right, *Calumniatores demonstrantur*, such are demonstrated to be Calumniators or Slanderers, *Posteriora enim inserta Epistola majori impietate plena sunt*, for those things which are set downe in the latter part or end of that Epistle, are more full of greater impietie, injuring *Cyrill*, and defending the impious heresie



heresie of *Nestorius*. So by the judgement of the whole Council, *Baronius* is not onely proved, but even demonstrated to be an *Heretike*, and a malicious *Caviller*, for his defending the latter part of this Epistle to be right and catholike. And this is al which he hath gained by renewing that old hereticall and rejected cavill for defence of *Vigilius*.

10. But what shall we then say to the proofes of *Baronius*? what first, to the *Interlocution* of the Popes Legates so often and with ostentation mentioned by the *Cardinal*? What? Truly the very same which the holy generall Council hath said before us, and taught, and warranted all others to say the same. The holy Fathers at *Chalcedon* (say they) did these things, *pro nihilo habentes ea quæ ab uno vel duobus pro eadem Epistola dicta sunt; esteeming worth nothing at all, those things which were spoken by one or two for that Epistle.* Thus testifieth the whole Synod, and themselves follow herein the judgement of the Fathers at *Chalcedon*: So by the judgement of two holy and generall Councils, that *Interlocution* of the Legates of Pope *Leo*, on which (after) *Vigilius* and *Baronius* relyeth, is worth nothing at all.

11. Yea, but *Eunomius*, as *Baronius* tells us, affirmeth, that though the beginning of the Epistle be hereticall, yet the end of it is found to be Catholike. *Baronius* indeed saith so of *Eunomius*; but what truth and honest dealing there is in *Baronius*, let the discreet Reader judge by this one saying among ten thousand the like; *Eunomius* saith not so, *Eunomius* saith the flat contrary, as in the fifth Council is clearly witnessed; where against this cavill of the old heretikes, whom *Baronius* followeth, they say<sup>f</sup> thus, *Nullam partem epistolæ apparet Eunomium comprobasse; it's evident that Eunomius approved no part at all of this Epistle.* And againe, *Quomodo præsumunt isti defensores calumniari interlocutionem Eunomij: how dare the defenders of this Epistle presume to slander the Interlocution of Eunomius*, as condemning one part of it, and approving another, seeing the whole epistle is full of impiety? I say yet more (which will manifest the Councils doome of *Baronius*, that he is a malicious caviller, to be most just) *Eunomius* speakes not either of the beginning or end of that Epistle in his *Interlocution*, but *Baronius*, according to his wont, foists in that clause (touching the end of the Epistle) out of his owne pate, and thereby falsifieth both the words and meaning of *Eunomius*. This in the Council is evidently declared by reciting the true words of *Eunomius* out of the Acts<sup>h</sup> at *Chalcedon*: which are these; *Ex recitatis, By those things which have beene read and recited, Ibas is shewed to be innocent: for wherein he seemed to be blame-worthy in accusing Cyrill, in posterioribus, or in postremis, recte confessus, having afterwards, or at the last, made a true confession, he hath refuted that wherein he was blamed: wherefore I also judge him worthy of his Bishoprike if, he accurse Nestorius, Eutyches, and their wicked heresies, and consent to the writings*

<sup>e</sup> Col. 6. p. 576. a.

<sup>f</sup> Col. 6. p. 564. a.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid.

<sup>h</sup> Act. 10. p. 116. a.  
<sup>i</sup> Con. 5. Col. 6. p. 564. a.

writings of *Leo*, and this generall Council. Thus said *Eunomius*: wherein there is neither mention nor intention of that Epistle, neither of the first, middle, nor last part thereof. But whereas in the Council of *Chalcedon*, many other <sup>k</sup> things, besides that Epistle, were recited touching the cause of *Ibas*, and particularly the whole *Acts* before *Photius*, *Eustathius*, and *Vranius* B. of Berithum, where a Synod was held about *Ibas*; it was those *Acts* and judgement given by them, and performed by *Ibas*, (and not the Epistle of *Ibas*) to which *Eunomius* had respect, when he said; by the *posteriora*, or *postrema*, *Ibas* made a true confession, for so in the fifth Council it is cleerly witnessed: *It is manifest* (say they) *that Eunomius made this speech, gesta apud Photium, et Eustathium attendens, looking at those Acts before Photius and Eustathius.* Now in those *Acts*, as is manifest by the diligent perusal thereof, and is further testified by the fifth Council, <sup>m</sup> there was a judgement pronounced by *Photius* and *Eustathius*, *adversus eam epistolam et qua in ea continentur*; against that Epistle, and the contents thereof: *Ibas* being commanded by those venerable Judges, both to embrace the first *Ephesine* Synod, which that impious Epistle rejecteth, and to condemne and accurse *Nestorius* and his followers, whom that Epistle commendeth: which judgement that *Ibas* then performed, the *Acts* before *Photius* and *Eustathius* doe make evident: for there it is thus said, <sup>n</sup> *Confessus est Ibas se credere: Ibas professed that he beleaved as the letters of Cyrill to Iohn did import*, and that he consented in all things to the first Synod at *Ephesus*, accounting their judgement as a decree inspired by the holy Ghost. Yea he did not onely in words professe this, but in <sup>o</sup> writing also, (at the perswasions of *Photius* and *Eustathius*) he expressed the like for the full satisfaction of such as had been before scandalized by his impious doctrine. And *Ibas* yet further of his <sup>p</sup> owne accord promised before those Judges, that he would in his own Church at *Edeffa*, and that publikely accurse *Nestorius* as the chief leader in that impious heresie, and those also who did thinke as he did, or who did use his books or writings. Thus much do those *Acts* declare.

12. This orthodoxall confession of *Ibas*, made before *Photius* and *Eustathius*, this accursing of *Nestorius* and his heresies, this embracing of the *Ephesine* Council, is that, which *Eunomius* calleth *Posteriora*, or *Postrema*, as following by many yeares, not onely that which *Ibas* did or said before the Vnion made betweene *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, but even this *Impious Epistle* also written after that Vnion. Of this confession *Eunomius* truly said, that by it (being *posterior*, later then the Epistle) *Ibas* had refuted all for which he was formerly blamed: for by this, in effect, he refuted, condemned, and accursed this whole Epistle with all the heresies and blasphemies, both in the head and taile thereof. And for this cause, and in regard of this holy confession, the fifth Council said, that thereby *Ibas* had anathematized his owne Epistle, *contrariam per omnia, being in every part of it contrary*

<sup>k</sup> Act. 9. & 10.

<sup>l</sup> Col. 6. pa. 564. a.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. pa. 563. & seq.

<sup>n</sup> Apud Conc. (bal. act. 9. pa. 108. a.

<sup>o</sup> Preparativus f. b. m. quod & amplexus est, ex scripto dare quid sentit de pia fide nostra. ibid. 107. b.

<sup>p</sup> Ex abundanti an te promissu, &c. ib.

<sup>q</sup> Ostenditur inde quod anathematizavit Epistolam &c Col. 6. pa. 564. a.

r Aeth. 20. Concil.  
Chal. pa. 113 b.

s Ibid.

trary to the faith, both in the beginning and end thereof. And the interlocution of Eusebius B. of Ancyra, at the Council of Chalcedon, doth fully explaine the meaning of *Eunomius*; for he expressly mentioneth those *Aeths* before *Photius* and *Eustathius*, and the confession of *Ibas* then made (which *Eunomius* called *posteriora*) saying thus, 'The reading of that judgement before *Photius* and *Eustathius*, doth teach that *Ibas*, in that judgement, accursed *Nestorius* and his impious doctrines, and consented to the true faith: Wherefore I receive him for a Bishop, if he now doe condemne *Nestorius*. The like said *Diogenes* B. of *Cyzicum*, *Thalassius* Bishop of *Cesarea*, *Iohn* Bishop of *Sebastia*, and they all cried, *Omnes eadem dicimus*, wee all say the same. So cleare it is that upon this holy Confession of *Ibas* made first before *Photius* and *Eustathius*, and after that, before all the Council at *Chalcedon*, and not upon this Epistle, nor any part, first or last thereof, *Ibas* was acknowledged and embraced for a Catholike, both by *Eunomius*, *Eusebius*, *Diogenes*, and all the whole Council of *Chalcedon*.

13. By this now appeareth not onely the error, but the extreme fraud of *Baronius*, who in excuse of *Vigilius*, not onely affirmeth an hereticall untruth, that the latter part of the Epistle is *orthodoxall*, but labours to uphold and boulder out that untruth with a malicious perverting and falsifying both of the words and meaning of *Eunomius*. And thus far proceeded the holy Council against *Vigilius* in their sixth Session, being the very next after they had received the Popes mandatorie letters, commanding them neither to speake nor write ought concerning the *Three Chapters*, otherwise then he by his Apostolicall constitution had decreed.

s Quae jam aetha  
sunt, relegantur: &  
relecia sunt. Col. 7.  
pa. 577. b.

14. In the seventh Collation, besides the publike reading of divers letters and writings for the manifestation of the truth, and of the uprightness of their judgment in this cause of the *three Chapters*; all that was formerly done, was now againe repeated and approved by the holy Council. Such diligence and warinesse they used in this matter, that nothing might passe without often recitall and serious ponderation by the whole Council.

v An. 553. nu. 219.

15. In the eight, which is the last Collation, the holy Council proceeded to their Synodall, and Definitive sentence, touching all those *Three Chapters*, which *Vigilius* (as they knew) by his decree and Apostolicall authoritie had defended. But the Council directly contradicting the Pope in them all, doth *Definitively* condemne and accurse them all, and all who defend them or any of them: which sentence of the Council, as *Baronius* truly confesseth, was pronounced *contra decreta ipsius (Vigilij)* in a direct opposition to the Decrees of *Vigilius*. Which that it may fully appeare, as you have before seene the words of the Popes Decree, so now consider also, and compare with them, the words and Decree of the Council.

16. First,



16. First the holy Council sets downe in generall their sentence concerning all the *Three Chapters*, (The defenders of which they had before <sup>x</sup>, and here <sup>y</sup> againe doe proclame to be heretikes) in this manner; We <sup>x</sup> accurse the *Three* foresaid *Chapters*, to wit, *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, with his impious writings, The impious writings of *Theodoret* against *Cyrl*, and the impious Epistle of *Ibas*, *et defensores eorum, et qui scripserunt, vel scribunt ad defensionem eorum*, also we accurse the Defenders of those *Chapters*, and those who have written, or who do (at any time) write for the defence of them, or who presume to say that they are right, or who have defended, *aut defendere conantur*, or who doe (at any time) indeavour to defend their impietie under the name of the holy Fathers, or of the Council at *Chalcedon*. Thus decreed the whole Synod. Now Pope *Vigilius*, as you have seene before, defended all these *Three Chapters*, he defended them by writing, yea by his *Apostolicall* authoritie, *Constitution*, and *Definitive* sentence: he defended them by the name of the holy Fathers, and of the Council at *Chalcedon*; Pope *Vigilius* then, by the judiciall and definitive sentence of this holy generall Council is an *Anathema*, a condemned and accursed heretike; yea a Definer of a condemned and accursed heresie. *Baronius* writeth earnestly in defence of Pope *Vigilius* and his *Constitution*, he commends him for defending those *Three Chapters*, saying, *The Defenders of them were praised while they had Pope Vigilius, whom they might follow*: and *Vigilius* himselfe he had <sup>b</sup> many and worthy reasons to make his *Constitution* in defence of those *Chapters*: he further presumes to defend *Vigilius* under the name and shew of consenting with the holy Fathers and Council at *Chalcedon*. *Card. Baronius* then by the same definitive sentence of this holy and generall Council, is an *Anathema* with *Vigilius*, a condemned and accursed heretike.

x *Qui hanc (Epistolam) non anathematizat, hereticus est.* Col. 6. pa. 576. b.  
y *Hereticorum condemnationem.* Col. 8. pa. 586. b.  
z *Ibid.* pa. 586. a.

a *An. 546. nu. 401.*

b *An. 553. nu. 233.*

17. After this generall sentence, the Council proceedeth, in particular & severally, to condemne each of these *Three Chapters* by it selfe. Of the first they thus define. *If any do defend impious Theodorus of Mopsuestia, et non anathematizat eum, and doe not accurse him and his impious writings, let such an one be accursed.* Now Pope *Vigilius* (as you have seene) would not himselfe, neither would he permit any other to accurse this *Theodorus*, he forbiddeth any to doe it, he made an *Apostolicall Constitution* that none should accurse him: *Card. Baronius* he writeth in defence of *Vigilius* and of his *Constitution* in this point: *Thomas Stapleton* goeth further, for he is so far from accursing this *Theodorus*, that he expressly calls <sup>d</sup> him a Catholike, yea a most Catholike Bishop: *Vigilius* then, *Baronius* and *Stapleton* are al of them accursed by the *Definitive* sentence of this holy generall Council, in this first Chapter.

c *Col. 8. pa. 587. b.*

d *Conc. b. l. divi. 68. pa. 171.*

18. Of the second Chapter they <sup>e</sup> thus decree. If any defend the writings of *Theodoret* against *Cyrl*, *et non anathematizat ea*, and

e *col. 9.*



and doe not accurse them, let him be an *Anathema*. *Vigilius* would not himselfe accurse them; he would not permit any other to disgrace *Theodoret*, or injure him by accusing his writings: *Baronius* defendeth and commendeth this decree of *Vigilius*; they both then are tyed againe in this third *Anathema* of the Council.

19. Though a threefold cord be not easily broken, yet the holy Council addeth a fourth, which is more indissoluble then any adamantine chaine. Of the *Third Chapter* they decree in this manner: <sup>e</sup> If any defend that impious Epistle of *Ibas* unto *Maris*, which denieth God to be borne of the blessed Virgin, which accuseth *Cyrril* for an heretike, which condemneth the holy Council of *Ephesus*, and defendeth *Theodorus* and *Nestorius*, with their impious doctrines and writings, if any defend this Epistle, *et non anathematizant eam, et defensores ejus, et eos qui dicunt eam rectam esse, vel partem ejus, et eos qui scripserunt et scribunt pro ea*; If any doe not accurse this Epistle, and the Defenders of it, and those who say that it, or any part of it, is right; If any do not also accurse those who have written, or who (at any time) doe write for it, and the impiety contained in it, and who presume to defend it by the name of the holy Fathers, or of the Council at *Chalcedon*, such an one be accursed. Now *Vigilius* (as was formerly declared) defendeth this Epistle, as orthodoxall, he defendeth it by his *Cathedrall* sentence and Apostolicall authoritie, he defendeth it under the name of the holy Fathers, and of the Council at *Chalcedon*; saying, <sup>g</sup> *Orthodoxa est Iba à patribus pronūciata dictatio*; *Baronius* defendeth both *Vigilius* and this Epistle in some part thereof, he defendeth them under pretence of the Fathers and Council at *Chalcedon*, saying, <sup>h</sup> *Patres dixerunt, eam Epistolam ut Catholicam recipiendam*; The Fathers at *Chalcedon* said, that this Epistle ought to be received as orthodoxall: Is it possible thinke you, by any shift or evasion, to free either *Vigilius* or *Baronius* from this fourth *Anathema* denounced by the judicall and Definitive sentence of this Holy Generall Council.

20. But what speake I of *Baronius*, as if he alone were a Defender of *Vigilius* and his *Constitution*? All who have, or who at any time doe hold, and defend, either by word or writing, that the Popes judicall and definitive sentence, in causes of faith, is infallible (and this is held, by *Bellarmino*, *Grezzer*, *Pighius*, *Gregorius de Valentia*, and, as afterwards I purpose to declare at large, by all and every one, who is truly a member of the present *Roman Church*) all these by holding and defending this one Position, doe implicitly in that, hold and defend every *Cathedrall* and definitive sentence of any of their Popes, and particularly this Apostolicall *Constitution* of Pope *Vigilius*, to be not only true, but infallible also: and so they all defend the *Three Chapters*; they defend the Defenders of them, by name Pope *Vigilius* among the rest. All these then are unavoidably included within all the former

g Conf. loc. cit. nu. 192.

h An. 553. nu. 191

iP nemo Catholicus esse possit, qui illa non amplectatur  
Greg. de Val. in 2. 3  
lib. 1. par. 1. pa. 30

former Anathemas all denounced and proclaimed to be heretikes, to be accursed and separate from God, by the judicall and definitive sentence of this holy generall Council.

21. With what comfort, alacritie and confidence may the servants of Christ fight his battles, and defend their holy faith and religion? or how can the servants of *Antichrist* chuse, but be utterly dismayed and daunted herewith, seeing they cannot wag their tongues or hands, to speake or write ought either against ours, or in defence of their owne doctrines, especially not of that which is the foundation of the rest, and is virtually in them all, but *ipso facto*, even for that act alone, if there were no other cause, they are declared and pronounced by the judicall sentence of an holy, generall, and approved Council, to be accursed heretikes.

22. The Council yet adds another clause, which justly challengeth a speciall consideration. Some there are who would be held men of such a milde and mercifull disposition, that though they dislike and condemne those assertions of the Popes supremacy of authoritie, and infallibility of judgement, yet are they so charitably affected to the Defenders of those assertions, that they dare not themselves, nor can indure, that others should call them heretikes or accursed: *Durus est hic sermo*, this is too harsh and hard. See here the fervour and zeale of this holy Council! They first say, Cursed be the defenders of this Epistle or any part thereof: As much in effect, as if they had said, Cursed be *Vigilius*, *Baraninus*, *Bellarmino*, and all who defend the Popes judgement in causes of faith to be infallible, that is, all that are members of the present Church of Rome, Cursed be they all. And not contenting themselves herewith, they adde, Cursed be he who doth not accurse the defenders of that Epistle or of any part thereof: As much in effect, as if they had said, Cursed be every one who doth not accurse *Vigilius*, *Baraninus*, *Bellarmino*, and all that defend the Popes judgement in causes of faith to be infallible, that is, all that are members of the present Romane Church, Cursed be he who doth not accurse them all. The holy Council no doubt had an eye<sup>k</sup> to the words of the Prophet Jeremy, <sup>l</sup> Cursed be he that doth the works of the Lord negligently, Cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood. To spare when God commands, and whom he commands to curse or kill, is neither pitty nor piety, but meere rebellion against the Lord, and pulls downe that judgement which God himselfe threatned<sup>m</sup> to *Ahab*, Because thou hast let goe out of thine hand, a man whom I appointed to dye, thy life shall goe for his life.

23. What then is there no meanes, no hope of such that they may be saved? God forbid. Far be it from my heart once to thinke, or my tongue to utter so hard a sentence. There is a meanes, and that after the Scripture, the Council expressly and

D

offer

<sup>k</sup> Nos timentes in  
leditionem, qua im-  
minet his qui negli-  
genter opera Domini  
faciunt, Col. 3. pa.  
584. a.

<sup>l</sup> Jer. 48. 10.

<sup>m</sup> 1 King. 10. 41.

Col. 8. 34.

Apoc. 18. 2. 3. 4.

p Iohannes in Apocalypsi passim Roma vocat Babylonem. Bell. lib. 2. de pont. Rom. cap. 2. 5. Præterea.

Babylon qua castra graditur, Roma quidem est. Riber. in ca. 14. m. Apoc. pa. 377. Et, Roma quæ in fine sæculi futura est. lib. pa. 378. Iohannes loquitur de Roma quæ sub fine mundi futura est. Grete, Def. ca. 13. lib. 3. de Rom. pont. pa. 927.

Babylon, quam esse Romanam ait lib. 7. pa. 228. sedes et civitas antichristi est. Sand. lib. 8. de visib. Monar. ca. 48.

q lra. 55. 7.

r Math. 18. 18.

s Col. 8. pa. 588. d.

often sets downe, even were they denounce all thole Anathemæ, for thus they say, " They who defend *Theodorus*, the writings of *Theodoret* against *Cyrill*, the impious Epistle of *Ibas*, or the defenders of them, *et in his usq. ad mortem permanent, and continue in this defence, untill they dye*, let such be accursed. Renounce the defence of these *Chapters*, and of the Defenders of them, that is, forsake and renounce that position of the Popes Cathedrall infallibility in defining causes of faith: renounce the defence of all that defend it, that is, of the whole present *Romane Church*, Come out of *Babylon the habitation of devils, the hold of all uncleane spirits, which hath made all nations drunke with the wine of her fornication*, which themselves cannot but acknowledge to be meant of Rome: This doe, and then, Come unto the Lord and he will have mercy, and to our God; for he is very ready to forgive: All your former impieties, heresies, and blasphemies shall not be mentioned unto you, but in the righteousness and Catholike truths which ye then embrace, you shall live. If this they will not doe, we accuse them not, we accurse them not: they have one who doth both accuse and accurse them; even this holy general Council, whose just Anathemæ shall as firmly binde them before God in heaven, as they were truly denounced by the Synod here on earth, for he hath sealed theirs and all like censures with his owne signet, who said, Whatsoever ye binde upon earth, shall be bound in heaven.

24. After all these just Anathemæ denounced as well in general as in particular by the Councill against the defenders of these *Three Chapters* or any one of them; the holy Synod sets downe in the last place one other point as memorable as any of the former: And that is by what authority they decreed all these things, of which they thus say, " we have rightly confessed these things, *que tradita sunt nobis tam à divinis scripturis, which are delivered unto us both in the divine scriptures, and in the doctrines of the holy Fathers, and in the definitions of faith made by the foure former Councils*. So the holy Councill. Whence it doth evidently ensue, that to teach and affirme, that the Pope in his judiciall and cathedrall sentence of faith may erre and define heresie; and that *Vigilius* in his constitution *de facto* did so, is a truth consonant to Scriptures, fathers, and the foure first general Councils: But on the other side, to maintaine or affirme (as do all who are members of the present *Romane Church*) that the Popes cathedrall sentence in causes of faith is *infallible*, is an hereticall position repugnant to Scriptures, Fathers, and the 4. first Councils, and condemned by them all. So at once the Holy Councill judicially defineth both our faith to be truly ancient & Apostolical, the selfe same which the Holy Fathers, generall Councils, and the Catholike Church professed for 600. yeares; and the doctrine of the present *Romane Church*, even that fundamentall position, on which all the rest doe relye, to be not onely new; but



but hereticall, such as none can maintaine, but even thereby he oppugneth and contradicteth both the Scriptures, Fathers, the foure first general Councils; and the Catholike Church for 600 yeares after Christ.

25. Further yet: because one part of their sentence is the accursing of all who defend the *Three Chapters*; either expressly, as did *Vigilius*, or *implicitè*, and by consequent, as do all who maintaine the Popes judgement in causes of faith to be infallible, that is, all who are members of the present Romane Church, and so die; it cleerely ensueth from that last clause of the Councill, that to condemne and accuse as heretikes all these, yea, all which doe not accurse these, is by the judgement of this whole generall Council, warranted by Scriptures, by Fathers, by the foure first generall Councils, and by the Catholike Church for 600 yeares after Christ: The judgement of this fifth Council being consonant to them all, and warranted by them all.

26. Neither is their *Decree* consonant onely to precedent Fathers, and Councils, but approved and confirmed by succeeding generall Councils, by Popes, and other Bishops, in the following ages of the Church. By the sixth Councill, which professeth of it selfe that *in omnibus consonuit; it in all points agreeth with the fifth*. By the second *Nicene*, (which they account for the seaventh) which reckoneth *this fift, for one of the golden Councils, which are glorious by the words of the holy Spirit, and which all being enlightened by the same spirit, decreed those things which are profitable*: professing that themselves did condemne all whom those Councils (and among them whom this fift) did condemne. By other following Councils, in every one of which the 2 *Nicene* (and by consequent this fift) Councill is approved, as by the acts is cleare: and *Baronius* confesseth *that this fift, in alijs Occumenicis Synodis postea celebratis cognita est atq; probata, was acknowledged and approved by the other generall Councils which were held after it*.

27. It was likewise approved by succeeding Popes and Bishops. By *Pelagius* the second, who writ an whole Epistle to perswade the Bishops of *Istria* to condemne the *Three Chapters*, telling *them that though Pope Vigilius resisted the condemnation of them, yet others his predecessours which followed Vigilius did consent thereunto*. By *Gregory*, who professing *to embrace & reverence the first Councils, as the 4 Evangelists, addeth of this fift, Quintū quoq; concilium pariter veneror; I do in like manner reverence the fift Councill*, wherein the impious Epistle of *Ibas* is rejected, & the writings of *Theodoret*, with *Theodorus* & his writings. And then of them all he faith, *Cunctas personas, whatsoever persons the foresaid (five) venerable Councils doe condemne, those also doe I condemne, whom they reverence I embrace, because seeing they are decreed by an universall consent, whosoever presumeth to loose, whom they bind, or bind whom they loose, se et non illa destruit, he destroyeth himselfe, but not those Councils; and whosoever thinketh otherwise, let him be accursed*. Thus



Pope Gregory the great, ratifying all the former anathemas of the Council, and accursing all that labour to unty those bands. By *Agatho*<sup>b</sup>, by *Leo*<sup>c</sup> the second, who both call this an holy Synod; and, not to stay in particulars, All<sup>d</sup> their Popes (after the time of *Gregorie*) were accustomed at their election to make profession of this fift, as of the former Councils, and that in such solemne and exact manner, after the time of *Hadrian* the second, that they professed (as their forme it selfe set downe by *Anton. Augustinus*<sup>e</sup> doth witnesse) to embrace the eight generall Councils, (whereof this was one) to hold them *pari honore et veneratione, in equal honor and esteem*, to keepe them intirely *usq. ad unum apicem, to the least iota*, to follow and teach whatsoever they decreed, and whatsoever they condemned to condemne both with their mouth and heart. A like forme of profession is set downe in the Council at *Constance*<sup>f</sup>, where the Council having first decreed the power and authoritie of the Pope to be inferiour and subject to the Council, and that he ought to be obedient to them both, in matters of faith and orders of reformation, by this their superior authoritie ordaineth, *That every Pope at the time of his election shall professe that, corde et ore, both in words and in his heart hee doth embrace and firmly beleieve the doctrines delivered by the holy Fathers, and by the eleven generall Councils (this fift being reckned for one) and that he will keepe, defend and teach the same faith with them, usq. ad unum apicem, even to the least syllable*. To goe no further, *Baronius* confesseth<sup>h</sup>, that not onely *Gregory* and his predecessors, (unto *Vigilius*) *sed successores omnes, but all the successors of Gregory* are knowne to have received and confirmed this fift Council.

28. Neither onely did the Popes approve it, but all orthodoxall Bishops in the world: it being a custome, as *Baronius* sheweth<sup>i</sup>, that they did professe to embrace the seven generall Councils, which forme of faith *Orthodoxi omnes ex more profiteri debent, all orthodoxall Bishops by custome were bound to professe*. And this, as it seemeth, they did in those *Litera Formata, or Communicatoria, or Pacifica*, (so they were called<sup>k</sup>) which from ancient time they used to give and receive. For by that forme of letters they testified their communion in faith, and peaceable agreemēt with the whole Catholike Church. Such an Vniforme consent there was in approving this fift Council in all succeeding Councils, Popes and Bishops, almost to these dayes.

29. From whence it evidently and unavoidably ensueth, that as this fift Synod, so all succeeding Councils, Popes and Bishops, to the time of the Council of *Constance*<sup>l</sup>, that is, for more then fourteene hundred yeares together after Christ, doe all with this fift Council condemne and accurse, as hereticall, the judicall and definitive sentence of Pope *Vigilius*, delivered by his Apostolical authority, for instruction of the whole Church in this cause of faith: & therfore they al with an uniforme consent did in heart

<sup>b</sup> In Cont. 6. Act. 4. pa. 16. a.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. ad Constan. Imp.

<sup>d</sup> Bar. an. 869. nu. 58. 59.

<sup>e</sup> In manuscripto codice ex quo cum citat Bar. loco citato

<sup>f</sup> Ses. 39. pa. 1644.

<sup>g</sup> Ses. 4. pa. 1560.

<sup>h</sup> An. 583. nu. 229

<sup>i</sup> An. 869. nu. 58.

<sup>k</sup> Cum quo totus orbis commercio formatum, concordat. Opt. lib. 2. p. 40. Querebam utrum epistolae communicatorias quas Formatas dicimus, possent quo vellent dare. Aug. Epist. 163. Sub probatione Epistolae, sine Pacificis, quae dicuntur Ecclesiasticae. Cons. Chalc. can. 11. Celebratum est an. 1414.

heart beleve, and in words professe and teach, that the Popes Cathedrall sentence in causes of faith, may be, and *de facto* hath been hereticall: that is, they all did beleve and teach, that doctrine which the reformed Churches maintaine, to be truly ancient, orthodoxall and catholike, such as the whole Church of Christ for more then 14 hundred yeares beleaved and taught: but the doctrine (even the Fundamentall position whereon all their doctrines doe relie, and which is virtually included in them all) which the present Church of Rome maintaineth, to be new, hereticall and accursed, such as the whole Church for so many hundred yeares together with one consent beleaved and taught to be accursed and hereticall. It hence further ensueth, that as this fift Council did, so all the fore-mentioned generall Councils, Popes and Bishops, doe with it condemne and accurse for heretikes not onely *Vigilius*, but all who either have or doe hereafter defend him and his *Constitution*, even all, who either by word or writing, have or shall maintaine that the Popes *Cathedrall* judgement in causes of faith is infallible, that is, all who are members of the present Romane Church, and so continue till their death: nay, they not onely accurse all such, but further also, even all who doe not accurse such. And because the decree of this fift Council is approved by them, to the least *ista*, it in the last place followeth, that the condemning and accursing for hereticall that doctrine of the Popes infallibilitie in causes of faith, and accursing for heretikes, all who either by word or writing have, or doe at any time hereafter defend the same, and so persist till they dye, nay, not onely the accursing of all such, but of all who doe not accurse them, is warranted by Scriptures, by Fathers, by all generall Councils, by all Popes and Bishops, that have bene for more then 14 hundred yeares after Christ.

This Uniforme consent continued in the Church untill the time of *Leo* the 10 and his *Laterane* Council. Till then, neither was the Popes authoritie held for supreme, nor his iudiciall sentence in causes of faith held for infallible: nay, to hold these was judged and defined to be hereticall, and the maintainers of them to be heretikes. For besides that they all till that time approved this fift Council, wherein these truths were decreed, the same was expressly decreed by two generall Councils, the one at *Constance*, the other at *Basil*, not long before that *Laterane* Synod. In both which it was defined, that not the Popes sentence, but the judgement of a generall Council, is the supreme in *rebus*, the highest judgement in earth, for rooting out of errors, and preserving the true faith, unto which judgement every one, even the Pope himselfe, is subject, and ought to obey, or if he will not, is punishable by the same. Consider beside many other, that one testimony of the Council of *Basil*, and you shall see they beleaved and professed this as a Catholike truth, which in all ages

Conc. Basil. finitum est an. 1442. id est, an. 74. ante concil. Later. in Concil. Basil. in Decreto quinq. conclus. p. 96. a. o. Cuius quilibet etiam papalis status existat, obediens tenetur. Conc. Constant. sess. 4. et Basil. sess. 2. p. Debitum puniatur. Conc. Constant. et Basil. sess. 3.

q Sess. 33.

of the Church had beene, and still ought to be embraced. They having recited that Decree of the Council at Constance, for the supreme authority of a Council, to which the Pope is subject, say thus, *Licet has esse veritates fidei catholica satis constet; although it is sufficiently evident, by many declarations made both at Constance, & here at Basil, that these are truths of the Catholike faith, yet for the better confirming of all Catholikes herein, This holy Synod doth define as followeth; The verity of the power of a generall Council above the Pope, declared in the generall Council at Constance, and in this at Basil, est veritas fidei Catholica, is a veritie of the Catholike faith; and after a second conclusion like to this, they adjoyne a third, which concernes them both; He who pertinaciously gainsayeth these two verities, est censendus hereticus, is to be accounted an heretike. Thus the Council at Basil, cleerly witnessing, that till this time of the Council, the defending of the Popes authority to be supreme, or his judgement to be infallible, was esteemed an Heresie by the Catholike Church, and the maintainers of that doctrine to be heretikes: which their decrees were not, as some falsely pretend, rejected by the Popes of those times, but ratified and confirmed, and that *Consistorialiter*, judicially and cathedrally by the indubitate Popes, that then were, for so the Council of Basil witnesseth; who hearing that *Eugenius* would dissolve the Council, say thus; *It is not likely, that Eugenius will any way thinke to dissolve this sacred Council, especially seeing that it is against the decrees of the Council at Constance, per prædecessorem suum et factum approbata, which both his predecessor Pope Martin the first, and himselfe also hath approved.* Besides this, that *Eugenius* confirmed the Council at Basil, there are other evident proofes: His owne Bull, or embossed letters, wherein he saith of this Council, *pura simplicitate, ac cum effectu, et omni devotione persequimur; we embrace sincerely, absolutely, and with all affection and devotion, the generall Council at Basil: The Council often mention his adhesion, his maximæ adhesionem to the Council; by which Adhesion, as they teach, *Decreta corroborata sunt, the Decrees of the Council at Basil made for the superiority of a Council above the Pope, were confirmed.* Further yet the Orators w<sup>th</sup> Pope *Eugenius* sent to the council, did not only promise, but corporally sweare before the whole Council, that they would defend the decrees thereof, & particularly that which was made at Constance was, & now renewed at Basil. Such an Harmonie there was in believing and professing this doctrine, (that the Popes judgement in causes of faith, is neither supreme nor infallible) that generall Councils at this time decreed it, the indubitate Popes confirmed it, the Popes Orators solemnly sware unto it, the Univerfall and Catholike Church untill then embraced it, and that with such constancy and uniforme consent, that, as the Council of Basil saith, (and their saying is worthy to be remembered) *numquam aliquis peritorum dubitavit, never any learned and skilfull man doubted ther-***

r Per Concilii generalia, qua summi Pontifices Consistorialiter declaraverunt esse legitima, etiam pro eo tempore, quo ejusmodi declarationes ediderunt. Conc. Basil. pa. 144. a.

s Epist. Conc. Basil. pa. 100. b.

t Literæ bullatæ Eugenij lesse sunt in Conc. Bas. Sess. 16.

v In sua adhesionem. Sess. 16.

x Decreto quinque Concl. pa. 96. b.

y Sess. 29. pa. 96. b.

z Jurabant ejus decreta defendere, &c. Sess. 16.

a Hoc veritas sollicitas ex sancti sollicitudine, per universam ecclesiam declarata est. Epist. Conc. Basil. pa. 144. a.

b In decreto quinque conclus. pa. 96.



of. It may be some illiterate *Gnathio* hath soothed the Pope in his *Hildebrandicall* pride, vaunting, *Se, quasi deus sit, errare non posse*; I sit in the temple of God, as God, I cannot erre; but for any that was truly judicious or learned, never any such man, in all the ages of the Church untill then, as the Council witnesseth, so much as doubted thereof, but constantly beleevd the Popes authoritie not to be supreme, and his judgement not to be infallible.

c *Hildebrandum sic gloriari solitum testatur Aven. lib. 5. Annal. pa. 455.*

d *Post. Biblic. in Nic. Cusano.*  
e *Obijt ann. 1464. Post. Conc. autem finitum est. an. 1442.*  
f *Lib. 2. de Concor. Cathol. ca. 17.*

g *claruit an. 1460. Tricem. de Scrip. eccl. in Job. de Tur.*  
h *Post. in Job. Tur.*  
i *Lib. de author. gener. Concil. pa. 88.*

k *Turr. summ. de eccl. lib. 2. cap. 93.*

l *Tunc Synodus major est Papa, ad quidem potestate iurisdictionis, sed authoritate discretivis iudicij. Turrec. in Bel. lib. 3. de iur. Dei. ca. 9. S. Præterea. Ec. lib. 2. de concil. ca. 18.*  
m *Post. in Nic. Tulle.*  
n *Cap. Significasti, de Elect. extrav.*

31. After the Council of *Basil*, the same truth was still embraced in the Church, though with far greater opposition then before it had: witness hereof, *Nich. Cusanus* a Bishop, a Cardinall, a man *sciens se bene omnibus excultus*, who lived 20<sup>e</sup> yeares after the end of the Council at *Basil*. He earnestly maintained the decree of that Council, resolving<sup>e</sup> that a generall Council is *omni respectu tam supra Papam quam supra sedem Apostolicam*; is in every respect superior both to the Pope and to the Apostolike see. Which he proveth by the Councils of *Nice*, of *Chalcedon*, of the first and 8 generall Councils, and he is so confident herein, that he saith, *Quis dubitare potest sana mentis? what man bring in his wits can doubt of this superioritie?* Witness *Iohn de Turrecremata*, a Cardinall also, who was famous at the same time, *He thought he was very unequal to the Council at Basil*, in favour belike of *Eugenius* the 4, who<sup>h</sup> made him Cardinall, yet that he thought the Popes judgement in defining causes of faith to be fallible, and his authority not supreme, but subject to a Council, *And rudine will tell you* in this manner: Let us heare him (*Turrecremata*) affirming that the Definitions of a Council concerning doctrines of faith, are to be preferred *iudicio Rom. Pontificis*, to the judgement of the Pope, and then he citeth the words of *Turrec.* that in case the Fathers of a generall Council should make a definition of faith, which the Pope should contradict (This was the very case of the first Council, and Pope *Vigilius*) *dicerem, iudicio meo, quod Synodus standam esset et non persona Papa*, I would say, according to my judgement, that we must stand to the Synods, and not to the Popes sentence: who yet further touching<sup>k</sup> that the Pope hath no superior Iudge upon earth, *extra casum hæresis*, unless it be in case of heresie, doth plainly acknowledge, that in such a case a Council is superior unto him. Superior, I say, not onely (as he minceth the matter) by authoritie<sup>l</sup> of discretive judgement, or amplitude of learning (in which sort many meane Bishops and presbyters are far his superiors) but even by power of Jurisdiction, seeing in that case (as he confesseth) the Council is a superior Iudge unto the Pope, and if he be a Iudge of him, he must have coactive<sup>m</sup> authoritie, and iudiciall power over him. Witness *Panormitanus*, an Archbishop, and a Cardinall<sup>n</sup> also, a man of great note in the Church, both at and after the Council of *Basil*. He<sup>o</sup> professeth that in those things, which concerne the Faith, or generall State of the Church, *Concilium est supra Papam*, the Council in those things is superior to the Pope. He also writ a booke in defence of the Council

Council



p. *Pos. loc. citat.*

q. *Obijt an. 1467.*

r. *Item in Ant. Ros.*

r. *Monarch. part. 2.*

ca. 15.

s. *Li. eod. par. 3 c. 21*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

u. *adit. 1591*

Council at Basill so distastfull to the present Church of Rome, that they have forbid it to be read, and reckned it in the number of Prohibited bookes in their Romane Index. At the same time lived Antonius Rosellus, a man noble in birth, but more for learning, who thus writeth, 'I conclude, that the Pope may be accused and deposed for no fault, nisi pro heresi, but for heresie strictly taken, or for some notorious crime scandalizing the whole Church: and againe, 'Though the Pope be not content or willing to be judged by a Council, yet in case of heresie, the Council may condempne and adnull *sententiam papa*, the Iudgement or Sentence of faith pronounced by the Pope; and he gives this reason thereof, because in this case the Council is *supra papam*, above the Pope: and the superior Iudge may be sought unto, to declare a nullitie in the Sentence of the inferiour Iudge. Thus he: and much more to this purpose. Now although by these (the first of which was a Belgian, the second a Spaniard, the third a Sicilian, and the last an Italian) it may be perceived, that the generall Iudgement of the Church at that time, and the best learned therein, was almost the same with that of the Council at Basill, that neither the Popes authoritie is supreme, nor his Iudgement in causes of faith is infallible, yet suffer me to adde two other witnesses, of those who were after that Council.

32. The former is the Iudgement of Universities, *quæ fere unanimes*, which all, in a manner, approved and honored that Council of Basill. The other is the Council at Bizarice (some take it for Barchinæ) called by Charles the seventh, the French King, in which was made *consensu omnium ecclesiasticorum, et principum regni*, by the consent of the whole clergy, and all the Princes of France, that Pragmaticall Sanction, which Iohn Marius calls *medullam*, the pith and marrow of the decrees of the Council at Basill. One decree of that Sanction is this, 'The authoritie of the Council at Basill and the constancie of their decrees, *perpetua esto*, let it be perpetuall, and let none, no not the Pope himselfe, presume to abrogate or infringe the same. This Sanction was published with full authoritie not seventy yeares before the Council at Lateran (as Leo the tenth witnesseth) that is, some four yeares after the end of the Council at Basill. And although the Popes (whose avarice and ambition was restrained by that sanction) did detest it, as Gagninus saith, *non secus ac perniciosam haresin*, no otherwise then, as a dangerous heresie, yea and labored tooth & naile to admit it, yet as saith the universitie of Paris, 'by Gods helpe, *hactenus prohibitum extitit*, they have beene ever hindered untill this time of Leo the tenth. Indeed Pius secundus indeavored and labored with Lewis the 11. to have it abrogated, and he sent a solemne embassador Card. Baluens, a very subtil fellow, to bring this to passe, but after much toyling both himselfe and others, *re infecta redijt*, he returned without effecting the Popes desire. And to goe no further, Leo the 10. and his Laterane Synod, are ample witnesses that this

Sanction

*Sanction* was never repealed, before that Synod, for they<sup>f</sup> complained that, by reason of the malignitie of those times, or else because they could not helpe it, his predecessors *tollerasse vif* *sunt*, seemed to have tolerated that *pragmaticall Sanction*, and that for all, which either they did or could doe, the same *Sanction retroactis temporibus viguisse, et adhuc vigere*; had in former times, and did even to that very day of their eleventh Session, stand in force, and full vigor. Now seeing that *Sanction* condemneth as hereticall (as did the Council also of *Basil*) that assertion of the Popes Supremacie of authoritie, and infallibilitie of judgment in defining causes of faith, which the present Romane Church defendeth, it is now cleerly demonstrated that the same Assertion was taught, professed, and beleaved to be an heresie, and the obstinate defenders thereof to be heretikes, by the consenting judgement of Councils, Popes, Bishops, and the Catholike Church, even from the Apostles time unto that very day of their *Laterane Session*, which was the 19. of *December*, in the yeare 1516. after Christ.

33 On that day (a day never to be forgotten by the present Romane Church, it being the birth-day thereof,) *Leo* the tenth with his *Laterane Council* (or as the learned Divines of *Paris* account it, *Conspiracie*, they being not assembled in Gods name) abolished, as much as in them lay, the old and Catholike doctrine, which in all ages of the Church had bene beleaved and professed untill that day, and instead thereof erect a new faith, yea, a new foundation of the faith; and with it a new Church also. Hee and his Synod then reprobated<sup>h</sup> the Decree of *Constance* for the superioritie of a Council above the Pope: they reprobated<sup>i</sup> also the Council of *Basil*, and the same Decree renewed by them. That Council they condemne as *Conciliabulum*, or<sup>k</sup> *Conventiculum*, *qua nullum robur habere potuerit*, As a *Conspiracie*, and *Conventicle*, which could have no force at all. They reprobated the<sup>l</sup> *Pragmaticall Sanction*, wherein the Decree of *Constance* and *Basil* was for ever confirmed. Now that Decree being consonant to that catholike Faith which for 1500 yeares together had bene imbraced, and beleaved by the whole catholike Church untill that day, in reprobing it, they rejected and reprobated the old and catholike Faith of the whole Church. In stead hereof they decreed the Popes authoritie to be<sup>m</sup> supreme, that it is, *de<sup>n</sup> necessitate salutis*; a thing necessary to salvation, for all Christians to be subject to the Pope; and that not onely as they are severally considered, but even as they assembled together in a generall Council: for they define *Solum<sup>o</sup> Romanum Pontificem auctoritatem super omnia Concilia habere*; The Pope alone to have authoritie above all Generall Councils. This the Council at *Laterane* diserte & ex professo docuit; taught cleerly and purposely, as *Bellarmino* tells<sup>p</sup> us: nay, they did not onely teach it, but expressissime<sup>q</sup> definiunt<sup>q</sup>, they did most expressly define it. And that their De-

finition

<sup>f</sup> Conc. Later. sess. 11

<sup>g</sup> *Leo 10. in quadam cetero, nescimus qualiter, tamen non in Spiritu Domini congregato. App. Univ. Paris.*

<sup>h</sup> *Qua de auctoritate Concilij supra Pontificem constituerunt. sententia Cœ. Lateranensis plane reprobata sunt. Bin. Not. in Conc. Const. § Ex parte.*

<sup>i</sup> *Reprobaverunt decretum Concilij Basiliensis. Bel. lib. 2. de Conc. ca. 17. § Denique.*

<sup>k</sup> *Conc. Lat. sess. 11. l Ibid.*

<sup>m</sup> *Hujus sancta & diu suprema auctoritate. Ibid. pa. 640. n Ibid.*

<sup>o</sup> *Ibid. pa. 639.*

<sup>p</sup> *Lib. 1. de Concil. ca. 17. § Denique*  
<sup>q</sup> *Lib. 2. de Concil. ca. 17. § Denique.*

r Lib. eod. ca. 17.  
§ Ad hunc.

s Proinde ultimum  
judicium summi pō-  
tificis esse. lib. 4. de  
Rom. pontif. ca. 1.  
§ Sed nec.  
r Restat igitur ut  
Papa sit iudex (ul-  
timus) et proinde nō  
possit errare. Lib. 4.  
de Pont. Rom. ca. 3.  
§ Contra. Et Dicit  
Concilij sententiam  
esse ultimum iudicium  
Hinc autem aperi-  
simè sequitur, non  
errare. Lib. 2. de  
Cons. ca. 3. § Acce-  
dat.

v In Apstel. à Leon.  
10. quæ facta est 21  
die Mart. an. 1517.  
Decret. Later. fact.  
19 Decemb. 1517.  
x A Relation of  
Religion in the  
West parts, publi-  
shed an. 1605. pa.  
129.

inition is no other then a *Decree of Faith*, as the same Cardinall assures us; Decrees of faith (saith he) are immutable, neyther may ever be repealed after they are once set downe; *Tale autem est hoc de quo agimus*, and such is this Decree for the Popes supreme authoritie over all, even Generall Councils, made in their *Laterane* Synod. And what meane they (thinke you) by that supreme authoritie? Truly the same which *Bellarmino* explaineth, That because his authoritie is supreme, therefore his judgement in causes of Faith, is the *last and highest*: and because it is the last and highest, therefore it is *infallible*. So by their Decree, together with supremacie of authority, they have given *infallibilitie* of judgement to the Pope; and defined that to be a catholike truth, and doctrine of Faith, which the whole Church in all ages untill then, taught, professed, and defined to be an heresie, and all who maintaine it, to be Heretikes, and for such condemned both it and them.

34 Now, because this is not onely a doctrine of their faith, but the very *foundation*, on which all their other doctrines of faith doe relie, by decreeing this, they have quite altered not onely the faith, but the whole frame and fabrick of the church, erecting a new *Romane* church, consisting of them, and them onely, who maintaine the Popes *Infallibilitie* and supremacie, decreed on that memorable day in their *Laterane* Synod: a church truly new, and but of yesterday, not so old as *Luther*, a church in faith and communion severed from all former generall Councils, Popes, and Bishops, that is, from the whole catholike Church of Christ, which was from the Apostles times untill that day. And if their Popes continue (as it is to be presumed they doe) to make that profession which by the *Councils of Constance* and *Basil* they are bound to doe, to hold among other, this fift Council *ad unum iōta*, this certainly is but a verball, no cordiall profession; there neither is, nor can be any truth therein, it being impossible to beleeeve both the Popes *Cathedrall* judgement in causes of faith, to be *hereticall*, as the fift Council defined; and the Popes *Cathedrall* sentence in such causes, to be *infallible*, as their *Laterane* Council decreed: So by that profession is demonstrated that their doctrine of faith is both contradictory to it selfe, such as none can possibly beleeeve, and withall new, such as is repngnant to that faith which the whole Catholike Church of Christ embraced, untill that very day of their *Laterane* Session.

35 Yea and even then was not this holy truth abolished. Foure moneths did not passe after that *Laterane* Decree was made but it was condemned by the whole Vniversitie of *Paris*, as being *contra fidem Catholicam*, against the catholike Faith, and the authority of holy Councils. And even to these dayes the *French Church* doth not onely distaste that *Laterane* Decree, and hold a Generall Council to be superiour to the Pope, but their



their Councill also of *Trent*, wherein that *Laterane* Decree is confirmed, is by them rejected. And what speake I of them? Behold, while *Leo* with his *Laterane Councill* strives to quench this catholike truth, it bursts out with farre more glorious and resplendent beauty. This stone, which was rejected by those builders of *Babylon*, was laid againe in the foundations of *Sion*, by those *Ezra's*, *Nehemiab's*, *Zorobabel's* and holy Servants of the Lord, who at the voyce of the Angell, came out of *Babylon*, and repaired the ruines of *Ierusalem*. And even as certaine rivers are said to runne under or through the salt Sea, and yet to receive no salt or bitter taste from it, but at length to burst out, & send forth their owne sweet and delightfull waters: Right so it fell out with this and some other doctrines of Faith. This Catholike truth (that the Popes judgement and *Cathedrall* sentence in causes of faith is not infallible) borne in the first age of the Church, and springing from the Scriptures and Apostles, as from the holy mountaines of God, for the space of 600 yeares and more, passed with a most faire and spacious current, like *Tygris* & *Euphrates* watering on each side the Garden of the Lord; or like *Pactolus*, with golden streames enriching and beautifying the Church of God: after that time it fell into the corrupted waters of succeeding ages, brackish (I confesse) before their second *Nycene* Synod, but after it and the next unto it, extremely salt and unpleasant, more bitter then the waters of *Mara*. And although the nearer it came to the streets of *Babylon*, it was still more mingled with the slime or mud of their *Babylonish* ditches; yet, for all that dangerous and long mixture, continuing about the space of 730. yeares, this truth all that time kept her native and primitive sweetnesse, by the constant and successive professions of the whole Church throughout all those ages. Now after that long passage through all those salt waves, like *Alpheus*, or *Arcthusa*, it bursts out againe, not as they did, in *Sicily*, nor neare the *Italian* shores, but (as the *Cardinall* tells us) in *Germanie*, in *England*, in *Scotland*, in *France*, in *Helvetia*, in *Polonia*, in *Bohemia*, in *Pannonia*, in *Sueveland*, in *Denmarke*, in *Norway*, in all the Reformed Churches, and being by the power and goodness of God, purified from all that mud and corruption wherewith it was mingled; (all which is now left in it owne proper, that is; in the *Romane* channels;) it is now preserved in the faire current of those Orthodoxall Churches, wherein both it and other holy doctrines of Faith, are with no lesse sinceritie professed, the they were in those ancient times before they were mingled with any bitter or brackish waters.

36 You see now the whole judgement of the Fifth Generall Councill, how in every point it contradiceth the *Apostolicall Constitution* of Pope *Vigilius*; condemning and accursing both it for hereticall, and all who defend it for heretikes: which their sentence, you see, is consonant to the Scriptures, and the whole Catholike

*Genil. Exam. C. 6.*  
*Trid. Sess. 13. &*  
*Car. Mel. des. conc.*  
*Trid. decret. pa. 3. 1*

*z. Alpheum fama est*  
*huc illic amnem,*  
*Osculas effluisse vias*  
*subter mare. Virg.*  
*lib. 3. Aeneid.*

*a Tot anni interfuit*  
*à Conc. Nic. 2. quod*  
*habitu est an. 787.*  
*ad annum quo Lu-*  
*therus se primum*  
*opposuit indulgentijs*  
*papalibus & pontifi-*  
*ci, qui fuit an. 1517*  
*Cocl. in vita Luther.*  
*b Brevi occupavit*  
*(Lutheri heresis)*  
*multa regna. Bel. 1. 3.*  
*de pontif. ca. 23.*  
*c Similitudo. Et,*  
*Romana sedes amissa*  
*nostris temporibus*  
*magna Germania*  
*partem, Suetiam, Go-*  
*thiam, Norvegiam,*  
*Daniam universam,*  
*bonam Angliam, Gal-*  
*liam, Helvetiam, Polo-*  
*nia, Bohemia, ac*  
*Pannonia partem,*  
*lib. eod. pa. 1. § de*  
*popea.*



Catholike Church of all ages, excepting none but such as adhere to their new *Laterane* decree and faith. An example so ancient, so authentically, and so pregnant to demonstrate the truth, which wee teach, and they oppugne, that it may justly cause any Papist in the world to stagger, and stand in doubt, even of the maine ground and foundation whereon all his faith relyeth. For the full clearing of which matter, being of so great importance and consequence, I have thought it needful to rip up every veine and sinew in this whole cause, concerning these *Three Chapters*, and the *Constitution* of *Vigilius* in defence of the same: and withall examine the weight of every doubt, evasion, & excuse, which eyther *Cardinall Baronius*, (who is *instar omnium*) or *Binius*, or any other, moveth or pretendeth herein, not willingly, nor with my knowledge, omitting any one reason, or circumstance, which either they urge, or which may seeme to advantage or help them, to decline the inevitable force of our former Demonstration.

## CAP. V.

*The first Exception of Baronius, pretending that the cause of the Three Chapters was no cause of faith, refused.*

Here is not, as I thinke, any one cause which *Card. Baronius* in all the Volumes of his *Annalls* hath with more art or industry handled, then this concerning Pope *Vigilius*, and the *Fift General Council*. In this hee hath strained all his wits, moved and removed every stone, under which hee imagined any help might be found, eyther wholly to excuse, or any way lessen the error of *Vigilius*. All the *Cardinalls* forces may be ranked into foure severall troupes. In the first do march all his Shifts and Evasions which are drawne from the Matter of the *Three Chapters*: In the second, those which are drawne from the *Popes Constitution*: In the third, those which respect a subsequent Act of *Vigilius*: In the fourth & last, those which concerne the *fift General Council*. After all these, wherein consisteth the whole pith of the Cause, the *Cardinall* brings forth another band of certaine subsidiary, but most disorderly souldiers, nay, not souldiers, they never tooke the Military oath, nor may they by the Law of armes, nor ever were by any worthy Generall admitted into any lawfull fight, or so much as to set footing in the field; meere thieves and robbers they are, whom the *Cardinall* hath set in an ambush, not to fight in the cause, but onely like so many *Shimei's*, that they might raile at and revile whomsoever the *Cardinall* takes a spleene at, or with whatsoever hee shall be moved in the heat of his choler: At the Emperour *Iustinian*, at

*Theodora*

Theodora the Emperesse, at the cause it selfe of the *Three Chapters*, at the *Imperiall Edict*, at *Theodorus* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, at the *Synodal acts*, yea, at *Pope Vigilius* himselfe, we wil first encounter the just forces of the Cardinall, which onely are his lawfull warriours, and having discomfited them, we shall with ease cleare all the coasts of this cause, from all his theevish, piraticall, and disordered straglers.

2. The first and chiefeft exception of *Baronius* ariseth from the matter & controversie it selfe touching these *Three Chapters*; concerning which he pretendeth, that no question of faith was handled therein, & so one dissenting from another in this cause, might not be counted or called an heretike. This was a question faith he, *de personis, & non de fide*; of persons and not of the faith. Againe, *Vigilius* knew, *Non de fide esse questionem, sed de personis*; that there was no question moved therein about the faith, but about certaine persons. And yet more clearly, In these disputations, faith he, *about the Three Chapters*, as we have oftē said, *Nulla fuit questio de fide*; *ut alter ab altero aliter sentiens dici posset hereticus*; there was no question at all about the faith, so that one dissenting from another herein, might be called an heretike. And this hee so confidently avoucheth, that he faith of it, *Ab omnibus absque ulla controversia consentitur*; all men agree herein without any controversie. Thus *Baronius*, whom *Binius* applauding, faith, *Sciendum est*, hee is knowne to all men, that in these disputations and differences about the *Three Chapters*, *non fuisse questionem ullam de fide, sed tantummodo de personis*; there was no question at all concerning the faith, but only concerning the persons. So he. Whereby they would insinuate, that *Pope Vigilius* did erre onely in a personall cause, or in a matter of fact, which they not unwillingly confesse that the Pope may doe; but he erred not in a cause of faith, or in any doctrinall position of faith, wherein onely they defend him to bee infallible.

3. Truly the Card. was driven to an extreme exigent, when this pious shift must be the first and best shelter to save the infallibility of the *Apostolike Chaire*. For to say truth, the maine controversie touching these *Three Chapters*, which the Councell condemned, and *Vigilius* defended, was onely doctrinall, and directly belonging to the faith; nor did it concerne the persons any other way, but with an implication of that hereticall doctrine which they and the defenders of these Chapters under that colour did cunningly maintaine: A truth so evident that I doe even labour with abundance of proofes.

4. *Iustinian* the religious Emperour, who called this Councell about this matter, committed it unto them, as a question of faith: We have, faith he, *commanded Vigilius to come together with you all, and debate these Three Chapters, that a determination may be given, recta fidei convenienter, consonant to the right faith*. Againe stirring them up to give a speedy resolution in this cause, hee

E

adder

a An. 547. nu. 30

b nu. 215.

b Ibid. nu. 46.

c Ibid. nu. 131.

d Not. in Conc. 5.

5. Nequid.

e Ibid. nu. 131.

f Ibid. nu. 131.

g Ibid. nu. 131.

h Ibid. nu. 131.

i Epist. ad Synod.

Coll. 1. pa. 520. d.

f Ibid. b.

addes this as a reason, *Quoniam qui de fide recta interrogatur: for when one is asked concerning the right faith, and puts off his answer therein, this is nothing else but a deniall of the true confession: for in questions & answers qua de fide sunt, which are questions of faith, hee that is more prompt and ready is acceptable with God.* Thus the Emperour.

5. The Holy Councell esteemed it, as did the Emperour, to be no other than a cause or question of faith; for thus they say, *in Coll. 8. pag. 584. a. Cum de fide ratio movetur, when a doubt or question is moved touching the faith, even he is to be condemned, who may hinder impiety, but is negligent so to doe; and therefore, Festinavimus bonum fidei semen conservare ab impietatis rixariis. We have hastened to preserve the good seed of faith pure from the tares of impiety.* So cleerly doth the whole generall Councell even in their definitive sentence call the condemning of the Three Chapters which themselves did, a preserving of the good seed of faith; and the defending of them, which *Vigilius* did, a sowing of hereticall weeds which corrupt the faith. Again, *in Ibid. pa. 586. b. We being enlightened by the holy Scriptures, and the doctrine of the holy Fathers, have thought it needfull to set downe in certaine Chapters, (those are the particular points of their Synodall judgement) Et predicationem veritatis, & hereticorum eorumque impietatis condemnationem: both the preaching of the truth, or true faith, and the condemning of Heretikes, and their impiety.* And in the end, having set downe those Chapters, and among them a particular and expresse condemning of these Three with an anathema denounced to the defenders of the, they conclude thus, *in Ibid. pa. 588. a. We have confessed these things being delivered unto us both by the sacred Scriptures, by the doctrine of the holy Fathers, & by those things which are defined, de una eademque fide, concerning one and the same faith by the foure former Councils.* Then which nothing can be more cleare to witnesse their decree touching these Three Chapters most nearly to concerne the faith, unlesse some of *Baronius* his friends can make prooffe, that the condemning of heretikes, and their impious heresies, and the maintaining of that doctrine which the Scriptures and Fathers taught, and the foure first Councils defined, is not a point of faith.

o Apud Bar. an.  
553. an. 106. 197.  
no 8. & alibi.

6. Neither onely did the Catholikes which were the condemners of these Three Chapters, but the heretikes also which were the defenders of them; they also consent in this truth, that the question concerning them, was a controversie or cause of faith. Pope *Vigilius* in his Constitution still pretendeth his Defence of Those Chapters to be consonant to the Councell at Chalcedon, and the Definition thereof: and of the Epistle of *Ibas* hee expressly saith, *The Councell of Chalcedon pronounced it to be orthodoxall.* And none I suppose will doubt, but that the question, whether that or any other writing be orthodoxall, and agreeable to the Definition of Chalcedon, as *Vigilius* affirmed that Epistle to be, or be heretical and repugnant to that Definition, as the Holy Councell adjudged that Epistle to be, is a plaine question and contro-

versie



versie of faith. *Victor B. of Tunen*, who suffered imprisonment and banishment for defence of these *Three Chapters*, teacheth the like; saying, *That Epistle of Ibas was approved and judged orthodoxall, by the sentence of the Councell at Chalcedon: and the condemning of those Three Chapters, is the condemning and banishing of that Councell.* *Facundus B. of Hermian*, who writ seven bookes of these *Three Chapters*, doth more than abundantly witnesse this of him. *Victor* thus writeth, *Evidentissime declaravit, Facundus* hath declared most evidently, that those *Three Chapters* were condemned in proscriptiōe fidei Catholica & Apostolica, for the exiling and rooting out of the Catholike and Apostolike faith. *Facundus* himselfe doth not onely affirme this, but prove it also, even by the judgement of Pope *Vigilius*. *Vigilius*, saith he, *esteemed the condemning of these Three Chapters to be so heinous a crime, that hee thought it fit to be reproved by those words of the Apostle, Avoid prophane novelties of words, and opposition of science falsely so called, which some professing have erred from the faith.* And hereupon, as if he meant purposely to refute this Evasion of *Baronius*, which it seemeth some did use in those dayes, he addes, *Quid adhuc quaritur utrum contra fidem factum fuerit; why doe any as yet doubt whether the condemning of them be against the faith, seeing Pope Vigilius calleth it prophane noveltie and opposition of science, whereby some have erred from the faith?* And a little after concluding, This saith he, *is not to be thought such a cause as may bee tolerated for the peace of the Church, sed qua merito judicatur contra ipsius fidei Catholica statum commota; but it must bee judged such a cause as is moved against the state of the Catholike faith.* Thus *Facundus* testifying both his owne, and the judgement of the other defenders of those Chapters, and by name of Pope *Vigilius*, that they all esteemed and judged this to bee a question and controversie of faith, of which *Baronius* tels us, that in it there was moved no question at all concerning the faith; and that Pope *Vigilius* knew, that it was no question of faith.

7. Now whereas the whole Church at that time was divided into two parts, the Easterne Churches with the holy Councell condemning; the Westerne with Pope *Vigilius* defending those *Three Chapters*, seeing both the one side and the other consent in this point, that this was a cause and question of faith, what truth or credit thinke you, is there in *Baronius*, who saith, that All men without any doubt agree herein, that this is no cause or question of faith: whereas all, both the one side and the other agree in the quite contrary. Truly the wisdom of the Cardinall is well worthy observing. He consenteth to *Vigilius* in defending the *Three Chapters*, wherein *Vigilius* was hereticall: but dissenteth from *Vigilius* in holding this to be a cause of faith, wherein *Vigilius* was orthodoxall; as if he had made some vow to follow the Pope, when the Pope forsakes the truth, but to forsake the Pope, when the Pope followeth the truth.

p In Chron. an. 2.  
post Consul. Basilij.  
q Iudicio Synodi ap-  
probata, & ortho-  
doxa iudicata est.  
ibid.

r In suo Chron.  
an. 10. post Consul.  
Basilij.

s Lib. 4. pro defen-  
sionem Capit apud  
Bar. an. 346.  
nu. 57.

t Ibid. nu. 58.

u Univerſus fere or-  
bis occidentalis ab  
orientali Ecclesia  
diviſus erat. Vin.  
not. in S. Conc. S.  
Concilium.



x Epist. 7. §. Pen-  
sate.

y Ibid. § Sed cur.

z Lib. 2. Ind. 10.  
Epist. 36.

a; Cap. 4.

b Lib. 1. de Cons.  
ca. 12. § Quartū.

8. Nor onely was this truth by that age acknowledged, but by succeeding, approved. By Pope *Pelagius*, who to reclame certaine Bishops from defence of those Chapters, wherein they were earnest, and had writ an apologie for the same, useth this as one speciall reason, because all those Chapters were repugnant to the Scriptures & former Councils. Consider, saith he, <sup>x</sup> if the writings of Theodorus, which deny Christ the Redeemer to bee the Lord, the writings of Theodoret, *qua contra fidem edita*, which being published against the faith, were afterwards by himsefe condemned; and the Epistle of Ibas, wherein Nestorius the enemy of the Church is defended; if these bee consonant to the Prophetickall, Euangelicall, and Apostolicall authority. And againe, <sup>y</sup> of the Epistle of Ibas he addeth, *If this Epistle be received as true, tota sancta Ephesine Synodus fides dissipatur*, the whole faith of the holy Ephesine Councell is overthrowne. Let here some of *Baronius* friends tell us how that question or cause doth not concerne the faith, the defending whereof (which *Vigilius* did) is by the judgement of Pope *Pelagius* repugnant to the Euangelical and Apostolicall doctrines, and even an utter & totall overthrow of the faith. To *Pelagius* accordeth Pope *Gregory*, who approved <sup>z</sup> this Epistle of *Pelagius*, & comended it as a direction to others in this cause. And what speake I of one or two, seeing the Decree of this fift Councell, wherein this is declared to be a cause of faith, is consonant to all former, and confirmed by all succeeding generall Councils, Popes and Bishops, til that time of *Leo* the 10. & his *Laterane* Synod, as before we <sup>a</sup> have shewed? was not this thinke you, most insolent presumption in *Baronius* to set himselfe as a *Iohannes ad oppositum*, against them all, and oppose his owne fancy, to the constant and consenting judgement of the whole Catholike Church for more than 1500 yeares together? These all with one voyce professe this to be a cause of faith: *Baronius* against them all maintaineth, that it is no cause of faith: and to heape up the full measure of his shame, addeth a vast untruth, for which no colour of excuse can be devised; *Consentitur ab omnibus*, that all men without any controversie agree herein, that this is no question nor cause of faith.

9. Besides all these, Card. *Bellarmino* setteth downe divers *tokens*, and cleare tokens whereby one may certainly know when a Councell decreeth or proposeth any doctrine *tanquam de fide*, to be received as a doctrine of the Catholike faith. This faith he, <sup>b</sup> is easily knowne by the words of the Councell, for either they use to say, that they explicate the Catholike faith; or else, that they who thinke the contrary are to be accounted heretikes; or, which is most frequent, they anathematize those who thinke the contrary. So he. Let us now by these markes examine this cause, and it will be most evident, not onely by some one of them, which yet were sufficient; but by them all, that the Holy Councell both held this controversie to be of faith, and also proposed their decree herein, as a Decree of faith.

10. For

10. For the first, the Councell in plaine termes professeth even<sup>e</sup> in their definitive sentence, that in their Decree they explain<sup>e</sup> that same doctrine which the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the four former Councels had delivered in their definitions of faith. Then undoubtedly by Bellarmines first note, their Decree herein is a Decree of faith, seeing it is an explication of the Catholike faith. c Coll. 8. pa. 588. a.

11. For the second, the Councell in like sort, in plain termes calleth the defenders of those three Chapters, heretikes. For thus cried al the Synod,<sup>d</sup> He who doth not anathematize this Epistle, is an Heretike: He who receiveth it, is an Heretike: This we say all. And in their definitive sentence they profess<sup>e</sup> that they set down the preaching of the truth, & Hæreticorum condemnationem, and the condemning of Heretikes. So by the second marke of Bellarmine it is undoubtedly, that the Councels Decree herein is a Decree of faith. d Coll. 6. pa. 576. b.

12. The third note is more than demonstrative. For the Holy Councell denounceth, not once or twice, but more I thinke than an hundred times an *Anathema* to them that teach contrary to their sentence. *Anathema* to Theodorus; *anathema* to him that doth not anathematize Theodorus; we all anathematize Theodorus and his writings. *Anathema* to the impious writing of Theodoret against Cyril: *Anathema* to all that doe not anathematize them: we<sup>h</sup> all anathematize the impious Epistle of Ibas: If<sup>i</sup> any defend this Epistle, or any part of it, if any doe not anathematize it, and the defenders of it, let him be an *Anathema*. f Coll. 4. pa. 537. a.  
g Coll. 8. pa. 586. et  
587.  
g Coll. 8. pa. 587. b.  
h Coll. 6. pa. 576. b.  
i Coll. 8. pa. 587. b.

13. So by all the notes of Cardinall Bellarmine, it is evident, not onely that this question about the Three Chapters, is a question of faith, but, which is more, that the holy generall Councell proposed their Decree herein, *tanquam de fide*, as a Decree of faith. Now because every Christian is bound to beleieve *certitudine fidei cui falsum subesse non potest*, with certainty of faith which cannot be deceived, every doctrine and position of faith, then especially when it is published and declared by a Decree of the Church to bee a doctrine of faith: Seeing by this Decree of faith which the Councell now made, not onely the Popes Apostolicall sentence in a cause of faith, is condemned to bee hereticall, but all they also who defend it, to be Heretikes and accursed; and seeing all defend it who maintain the Popes cathedrall sentence to be infallible, that is, all who are members of the present Church of Rome: it hence inevitably ensueth, that every Christian is bound to beleieve *certitudine fidei cui falsum subesse non potest*, not onely the doctrine, even the fundamentall doctrine of the present Church of Rome to be hereticall, but all that maintaine it; that is, all that are members of that Church, to be heretikes and accursed, unlesse disclaiming that heresie they forsake all communion with that Church. Baronius perceiving all those *Anathemas* to fall inevitably upon himselfe, and their whole Church, if this cause of the Three Chapters which Vigilius defended and defined by his Apostolicall Constitution, that they must be defended,

ded; if this I say were admitted to be a cause of faith, that hee might shuffle off those *Anathemas*, which like the leprosie of *Gehazi* doth cleave unto them; thought it the safest, as indeed it was the shortest way, to deny this to be a cause of faith, which not onely by all the precedent witnesses, but by the judgement of their owne Cardinall, and all the three notes set downe by him, is undeniably proved to bee a cause of faith, and that the Decree of the Holy Councell concerning it, is proposed as a Decree of faith.

k Ob easdem heresim decrevis eos esse alienos à diaconorū honore. Lib. 7. de visib. Monarch. an. 537.

l An. 546. nu. 47.

m An. eodē. nu. 43.

n Ibid. nu. 50.

o An. 547. nu. 50.

14. I might further adde their owne *Nicholas Sanders*, who though he saw not much in matters of faith, yet he both saw and professed this truth, and therefore in plaine termes calleth \* the defending of the *Three Chapters* an heresie. Now heresie it could not be, unlesse it were a cause of faith, seeing every heresie is a deviation from the faith. But omitting him, and some others of his ranke, I will now in the last place adde one other witness, which with the favourites of *Baronius* is of more weight and worth, than all the former, and that is *Baronius* himselfe, who, as he doth often deny, so doth he often and plainly profess this to be a cause of faith. Speaking of the Emperours Edict concerning these *Three Chapters*, he bitterly reproveth; yea, he reproacheth the Emperour for that he would <sup>1</sup> arrogate to himselfe *edere sanctiones de fide Catholica*, to make Edicts about the Catholike faith. Again, the whole Catholike faith, faith he, would <sup>m</sup> be in jeopardy, if such as *Iustinian de fide leges sanciret*, should make lawes concerning the faith. Againe, <sup>n</sup> *Pelagius* the Popes Legate founded an alarum *contra ejusdem Imperatoris de fide sancitū Edictū*, against the Emperours Edict published concerning the faith. And yet againe, <sup>o</sup> Pope *Vigilius* writ letters against those *qui edito ab Imperatore fidei decreto subscripsissent*, who had subscribed to the Emperours Edict of faith. So often, so expressly doth *Baronius* profess this to be a cause of faith, which himselfe, like the *Æsopicall Satyr*, had so often, and so expressly denied to be a cause of faith; and that also so confidently, that he shamed not to say, *Consentitur ab omnibus*, all men agree herein, that this is no cause of faith; whereas *Baronius* himselfe dissenteth herein, confessing in plaine termes this to be a cause of the Catholike faith.

15. The truth is, the Cardinals judgement was unsetled, and himselfe in a manner infatuated in handling this whole cause touching *Vigilius* and the fift generall Councell. For having once resolved to deny this one truth, that *Vigilius* by his *Apostolicall* sentence maintained and defined heresie, and decreed that all other should maintaine it, (which one truth, like a *Thesean* threed would easily and certainly have directed him in all the rest of his Treatise,) now he wandreth up and down as in a Labyrinth, toiling himselfe in uncertainties and contradictions, saying, and gainsaying, whatsoever either the present occasiō which he hath in hand, or the partialitie of his corrupted judgement, like a vio-

leat



lent tempest doth drive him unto, when the Emperour or his Edict (to both which he beares an implacable hatred) comes in his way, then this question about the *Three Chapters*, must bee a cause of faith: for so the Cardinall may have a spacious field to declame against the Emperour for presuming to intermeddle and make lawes in a cause of faith. But when Pope *Vigilius* or his *Constitution* (with which the Cardinall is most partially blinded) meet him, then the case is quite altered, the question about the *Three Chapters* must then bee no more a question or cause of faith; for that is an easie way to excuse *Vigilius*, and the infallibilitie of his Chaire: he erred onely in some personall matters, in such the Pope may erre; he erred not in any doctrinall point, nor in a cause of faith; in such is hee and his Chaire infallible.

16. There remaineth one doubt, arising out of the words of *Gregory*, by the wilfull mistaking whereof *Baronius* was misled. He seemeth to teach the same with the Cardinall, where speaking of this fift Synod, hee saith, <sup>p. An. 547. nu. 30.</sup> *In eâ de personis tantummodo, non autem de fide aliquid est gestum;* <sup>q. an. 553. nu. 231.</sup> In it was onely handled somewhat concerning those persons, but nothing concerning the faith. So *Gregory*, whose words if they be taken without any limitation, are not onely untrue, but repugnant to the consenting judgement of Councils and Fathers above mentioned, even to *Gregory* himselfe: for speaking of all the five Councils held before his time; he saith, <sup>q. Lib. 3. Epist. 37.</sup> *Whosoever embraceth, prædictarum Synodorum fidem, the faith explained by those five Councils, peace be unto them.* And if hee had not in such particular manner testified this; yet seeing hee approveth (as was before shewed) this fift Council and the Decree therof; & seeing that Decree clearly expresseth this to have beene a cause of faith, grounded on Scriptures, and the definitions of faith set downe in former Councils; even thereby doth *Gregory* certainly imply, that he accounted this cause for no other than (as the Synod it selfe did) for a cause of faith. <sup>f. Lib. 1. Epist. 24.</sup> <sup>f. Ca. 4. nu. 27.</sup>

17. What then is *Gregory* repugnant to himselfe herein? I list not to censure so of him; rather by his owne words I desire to explaine his meaning. There were divers in his time, as also in his Predecessor's *Pelagius*, who condemned this fift Council, because, as they supposed, it had altered and abolished the faith of the Council at *Chalcedon*, by condemning these *Three Chapters*, and had established a new doctrine of faith. *Gregorie* intreating against these, whom he truly calleth <sup>Exeuntis maligni homines turbaverunt animos vestros.</sup> malignant persons, and troublers of the Church, denieth, and that most justly, that this Council had done ought in the faith; not simply, as if they had done nothing at all, but nothing in such a manner as those malignant persons intended; nothing that was contrary to the faith decreed at *Chalcedon*; nothing that was new, or uncouth in the doctrine of faith; in this manner the Council did nothing in the faith. Heare the words of *Gregorie* expressing thus much; *Some there are* (saith hee) *who affirme, that in the time of Iulian*

there was somewhat decreed against the Councell at Chalcedon; But such men neither reading, neither beleeving those who read, remaine in their error; for we professe, our conscience bearing witnesse unto us, *de fide ejusdem Concilij nihil esse motum, nihil violatum;* that nothing concerning the faith of that Councell at Chalcedon, was here (in the fift Councell) moved or altered, nothing violated or hurt; but what soever was done in this fift Synod, it was done, that the faith of the Councell at Chalcedon should in no sort be infringed. So Gregory, who to like purpose againe saith, <sup>2</sup> *In the Synod concerning the Three Chapters it is manifest, nihil de fide convulsum esse, nihil immutatum;* that nothing concerning the faith was weakened, nothing changed therein.

<sup>1</sup> Lib. 3. Ind. 10.  
Epist. 36.

<sup>7</sup> Lib. 7. Epist. 54.

<sup>2</sup> Lib. 3. Ind. 11.  
Epist. 10.

18. Now as against their first calummie, Gregory teacheth, that nothing was done contrary to the faith of the Councell at Chalcedon; so against their other he sheweth, that they decreed no novelty in the faith, nor ought else but what was formerly decreed at Chalcedon. To which purpose he saith <sup>2</sup> of this fift Synod, that it was in omnibus sequax, in every point an imitator & follower of the Councell at Chalcedon: & again <sup>2</sup> more clearly, In this fift Synod nothing else was done, quā apud Chalcedonē sem Synodū fuerat constitutū; then was formerly decreed in the Councell at Chalcedon. So Gregory. Both this fift, & that at Chalcedon (as also the former at Ephesus) decreed one and the selfe same faith, as by Gregory is truly witnessed: but the Councell at Chalcedon and Ephesus decreed it absolutely, without any expresse reference to those persons or writings which are condemned in the fift, though in them both was *implicitē* contained a condemnation of all these Three Chapters; the fift Councell decreed it with an expresse reference to these Chapters, and an explicite condemnation of them. The Decrees made at Ephesus and Chalcedon were Introductive; as first condemning those heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches. The Decree of this fift Councell was onely Corroborative, or Declarative, explaining and corroborating those former decrees, by condemning these writings of Theodorus, Theodoret, and Ibas, which did overthrow the same. As Vigilius and other followers of Nestorius, did not at this time broach any new heresie, but under those Three Chapters on which they put the visor of the Councell at Chalcedon, sought to revive the heresie of Nestorius, which before, when it came in its owne habit, was condemned: Even so the fift Councell needed not, neither did they condemne any new, but unmasked the old & condemned heresie of Nestorius lurking under the defence of these Three Chapters; they pulled off the visor of Chalcedon from it, under which it most subtilly now sought to insinuate it selfe, and creep into the Church. And when Gregory saith, that in this fift Councell they dealt *tantummodo de personis*, that *tantummodo*, in his sense doth not exclude all handling of the faith, not the explaining, not the corroborating of the faith, for both these they certainly did, and Gregory acknowledgeth: but it onely excludes such an handling of the faith as was used at Ephesus

*ephesus* and *Chalcedon*, by making an *Introductive* decree for condemning some new heresie. The fifth Councell dealt onely with persons, without making such a Decree; yet it dealt with those persons with an intent to explaine and corroborate those *Introductive* decrees.

19. The words of *Gregory* next following those on which *Baronius* relied, doe yet more fully explaine this to have beene his meaning. In the fifth Synod nothing was done concerning the faith, but only the persons; and those persons, *de quibus in Chalcedonensi Synodo nihil continetur, concerning w<sup>ch</sup> persons nothing is contained or set downe in the Councell at Chalcedon*. For as there is much contained in that Councell concerning those persons, especially *Ibas*, (in whose cause, and the examining thereof, two whole Actions are bestowed) and yet in a favourable construction, or according to *Gregory* his meaning, he might truly say, that nothing concerning them is contained there; to wit, nothing to condemn *Theodorus*, or the writings of *Theodoret* and *Ibas* in such an expresse and particular manner as they are condemned in the fifth Councell: Right so, though the fifth Councell not onely handled a cause of faith, but published their decree as a Decree of faith; yet in a like favourable construction, and according to *Gregories* meaning he might truly say, that nothing was done therein concerning the faith, to wit, nothing to make such an *Introductive* decree for condemning a new heresie, as was formerly made in the Councell at *Chalcedon*. a. 11. 9. & 10.

20. By all which the true meaning of *Gregory* is now by his owne explaining most evident. In the fifth Councell nothing was done contrary to the faith, (as the malignant slanderers of this Councell pretended) nothing was done *de novo*, so condemn any new heresie; nothing was done absolutely, or without reference to these *Three Chapters*: all this *Gregory* truly intendeth, when he saith, nothing was done therein concerning the faith: but seeing all that was done in the Councell, was done to explaine, confirme & corroborate the faith decreed at *Chalcedon*, & *Ephesus*; as *Gregory* himselfe professeth, it undoubtedly followeth, that even for this cause, and by *Gregories* owne testimonie, the question here defined was a cause and question of faith. Vpon *Gregories* words the Cardinall might well have collected, that *Vigilius* in defending the *Three Chapters*, erred not in any new heresie, or new question of faith, such as was not before condemned; but that he erred not at all in a cause of faith, is so farre from the intent of *Gregory*, that out of his expresse words the quite contrary is certainly to be collected. For how can the Pope be said not at all to erre in the faith, when by his *Apostolicall* Constitution he defendeth that cause of the *Three Chapters*, the defending whereof contradicteth a former definition of faith, and utterly overthroweth the holy Councell of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*; yea, the whole Catholike faith?

21. Neither



b Socr. lib. 2. ca. 16.  
 Ex pluribus quam  
 35 provinciis col-  
 lecta. Athan. Epist.  
 ad solit. vitam  
 agent. pa. 225.  
 c Ab universali  
 Sardicensi Synodo.  
 Iust. Edict. § Quod  
 autem.  
 d Bin. Not. in Conc.  
 Sard. § Cum igitur.  
 e Bell. lib. 2. de  
 Rom. Pont. chap. 35  
 § Tertia.  
 e Locū citat.

f Can. 6. & 7.

g Act. 15. pa. 80.  
 Sāctas & universa-  
 les quinque Synodos,  
 & superbas &  
 quinta Synodi.  
 h Cap. 1.

21. Neither must this seeme strange to any, that the fift generall Councell did onely explaine and confirme a former definition of faith, and made no decree to condemne any new heresie repugnant to the faith. The like hereof in some other Councils may be obserued. The Councell of *Sardica* was a generall holy Councell, as beside <sup>b</sup> others the Emperor *Iustinian* in that his <sup>c</sup> Edict witnesseth: and yet in it, <sup>d</sup> *nihil novi quoad fidem definitū est; no new doctrine of faith was there defined*, nor any new heresie condemned, but onely the faith decreed at *Nice* was corroborated, and confirmed. And the cause why the *Sardican* Councell is not reckoned in the order of generall Councils, was not that which <sup>e</sup> *Bellarmino* and *Binius* fancie; because the *Sardican* and *Nicene* were held to be one and the same Councell, (for neither were they so indeed, being called by different Emperours, to different places, at different times, and upon different occasions; neither were they ever by the ancient, or any of sound judgement held for one Synod) but the true reason thereof was this, because the *Sardican*, though in dignity & authority it was equall to the *Nicene*, yet onely confirmed the Decree of faith formerly made at *Nice*, and made no new or *Introductive* decree, to condemne any heresie, as did the other at *Nice*. And truly for the selfe same reason, the Church might, if they had pleased, have done the like to this fift Councell, and not have accounted it no more than they did the *Sardican*, in a distinct number; but onely esteemed it a Councell *corroborative* of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, as that at *Sardica* was of the *Nicene* Councell, which some Churches also did, as by the 14. Councell at <sup>f</sup> *Toledo*, held a little after the sixt generall, appeareth; wherein this fift being for that cause omitted; the sixt, held under *Constantinus Pogonatus*, is reckoned as the fift, or next Councell to that at *Chalcedon*. But for as much as this cause about the *Three Chapters* had bred so long, and so exceeding great trouble in the Church; and because the explanation of the faith made in this fift Councell upon occasion of those Chapters, was so exact, that it did in a manner equal any former decree of faith, and benefit the whole Church as much as any had done: it pleased the Church for these reasons, with one consent, declared first in the sixt<sup>h</sup> Councell; and then in the 2.<sup>h</sup> *Nicene*, and divers other after it, to account this for the fift, and ranke it as it well deserveth, in the number of holy and golden generall Councils.

22. It now I hope clearly appeareth how unjustly the Cardinall pretends the words of Pope *Gregory*, as denying this to be at all any cause of faith; whereas not onely by the Emperour, by the fift Councell, by the defenders as well as the condemners of these Chapters; by succeeding generall Councils; by Popes, even Pope *Gregory* among the rest; by the Catholike Church, and consent thereof untill their *Laterane Synod*; but even by their owne writers, Cardinall *Bellarmino*, *Sanders*, yea, by *Baronius* himselfe,

it

it is evidently proved so nearely to concerne the faith, that to defend these Chapters (which *Vigilius* did) is to enervate and overthrow; and to condemne them (which the Councell did) is to uphold and confirme the Holy Catholike faith. And although this alone (if I should say no more) were sufficient to oppose to this first Evasion of *Baronius*; yet, that both the truth hereof may more fully and further appeare; and that the most vile and shamelesse dealing of *Baronius* in this cause, such as I thinke few heretikes have ever parallel'd, may be palpable unto all; To that which hitherto we have spoken in generall concerning all these *Three Chapters*, I purpose now to adde a particular consideration of each of them by it selfe; whereby it will be evident, that every one of these Chapters doth so directly concerne the faith, that the defence of any one of them, but especially of the two last, is an oppugnation, yea an abnegation of the whole Christian faith.

## CAP. VII.

That the first reason of *Vigilius* touching the first Chapter, why *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia* ought not to be condemned, because none after their death ought *noviter* to be condemned, concerns the faith, and is hereticall.

**I**N the first Chapter, wherein *Vigilius* defendeth that *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, being long before dead, ought not to be condemned for an heretike; the Popes sentence relyeth on three reasons; the examination whereof, wil both open the whole cause concerning this Chapter, and manifest the foule errors of *Vigilius*, as well doctrinall, as personall, as well concerning the faith, as the fact.

His first reason is drawne from a generall position, which *Vigilius* taketh as a Maxime, or doctrinall principle in divinitie. *Nullo licere noviter aliquid de mortuorum judicare personis; it is lawfull to condemne none after their death; who were not in their life time condemned; and therefore not Theodorus.* That *Theodorus* in his life time was not condemned, *Vigilius* proveth not; but presupposeth; nor doe I in that dissent from him; for although that testimony of *Leonius* be exceeding partiall and untrue; where he saith, that *Theodorus* and *Diodorus* in *presio haberi mortem oppetiere*, died in honour; neither did any, while they lived reprove any of their sayings; yet are there divers other inducements to perswade, that *Theodorus* was not in his life time, by any publike judgement of the Church, either declared, or condemned for an heretike: for besides that neither *Cyrril*, nor *Proclus*, nor the first generall Councell, doe mention any such matter, the words of

*Cyrril*

d Cyril. epist. ad  
Procl. in Conc. 5.  
Coll. 5. pa. 550, 551.

e Conc. 5. Coll. 5.  
pa. 552. & seq. in  
alt. Synod. Mops.

Cyril doe plainly import the contrary. The Ephesine Synod, saith & he; *forbare in particular, and by name, to anathematize Theodorus, which they did dispensative, by a certaine dispensation, indulgence, or connivence, because divers held him in great estimation, or account: what needed either any such dispensation, or forbearance, had he in his life time beene publicly condemned for heresie.* Again, the Church of Mopsvestia, where hee was Bishop, for divers yeares after his death, retained his name in *Diaplasia*, that is, in their Ecclesiasticall tables, making a thankfull commemoration of him, as of other Catholikes in their Liturgie, which, had he beene in his life time condemned for an heretike, they would not have done. Lastly, what needed the defenders of the *Three Chapters* have beene so scrupulous, to condemne him being dead, had he in his life time beene before condemned? Or how could this have given occasion of this controversie, whether a dead man might *Noviter* be condemned, if *Theodorus* had not beene *noviter* condemned when he was dead.

3. Wherefore this particular being agreed upon, that *Theodorus* was not before, but after his death condemned, the whole doubt now resteth in the *Thesis*, whether a dead man may *Noviter* be condemned. Now that this is no personall, but meerly a dogmaticall cause, and controversie of faith, is so evident, that it might be a wonder that *Baronius*, or any other, should so much as doubt thereof, unlesse the Apostle had foretold, that *because men doe not receive the love of the truth, therefore God doth send unto them strong delusions, that they may believe lyes.* Certaine it is that Pope *Vigilius*, held this for no other, but a doctrine of faith, for he sets it downe as a *Definition, or Constitution* of his predecessors, decreed by the *Apostolike See*: particularly by Pope *Leo*, and *Gelasius*; and so decreed by them, as warranted, and taught by the Scriptures, for out of those words, *Whatsoever ye binde, or loose upon earth, Pope Gelasius* <sup>h</sup> *colleth*, and *Vigilius* consenteth unto him, that such as are not upon earth, or among the living, *has non humano, sed suo Deo iudicio reservavit*; God hath exempted them from humane, and reserved them to his owne judgement: *nec audet Ecclesia, nec dare the Church challenge to it selfe the judgement of such.* As the Pope, so also the holy generall Council tooke this for no other, than a question of faith, for they plainly professe, even in their Synodall resolution, that their decree concerning dead men, that they may be *Noviter* condemned, is not onely an Ecclesiasticall tradition, but an *Apostolicall doctrine* also, warranted by the texts, and testimonies of the holy Scriptures. To which purpose alledging divers places of Scripture, they adde these words; It is many wayes manifest, that they who affirme this, [that men after their death may not *Noviter* be condemned,] *nullam curam Dei iudiciorum faciunt, nec Apostolicarum pronuntiationum, nec patrum traditionum*; that such have no regard either to the word of God, or the Apostles doctrine, or the tra-

g Perpleximus si  
quid de his prede-  
cessores nostri de-  
creverint. Vig.  
Const. loc. citat.  
nu. 176.  
Huius causa for-  
mam veneranda  
predecessorum no-  
strorum constituta,  
nobis apertissime  
tradiderunt. Ibid.  
Idem regni via A-  
postolica sedis de-  
minuit constituta.  
Ibid. nu. 179.  
h Ibid. nu. 177.

i Licet cognoscere  
Ecclesiasticam  
de impiis traditio-  
nem. Coll. 5.  
pa. 555. a.



diction of the Fathers. So the whole Councell judging, and decreeing Pope *Vigilius* to be guilty of all these.

4. Now when both the Pope on the one side, and the whole generall Councell on the other, that is, both the defenders, and condemners of *this Chapter* professe it to be a doctrine taught in the Scripture, and therefore undoubtedly to be a cause of faith; what insolency was it in *Baronius* to contradict them both, and, against that truth, wherein they both agree, to deny *this Chapter* to be a cause of faith? or seeing it is cleare, both by the Pope, and Councell, that the resolution of this question is set downe in Scripture, what else can bee thought of *Baronius* denying either the one, or the other part, to bee a cause, or assertion of faith, but that with him the doctrines defined, and set down in Scriptures, are no doctrines or assertions of faith, at least, not of the Cardinals faith?

5. Seeing now this is a cause of faith, and in this cause of faith, the Pope, and generall Councell are at variance; either of them challenge the Scripture, as consonant to his, and repugnant to the opposite assertion; what equall and unpartiall umpire may be found to judge in this matter? *Audito Ecclesia nomine hostis expalluit*, saith their vaine, and vaunting <sup>k</sup> Braggadochio; *Hast thou appealed to the Church? to the Church, and judgement thereof shalt thou goe*; at the name of which, we are so farre from being daunted, or appaled, that with great confidence, and assurance of victory, we provoke unto it.

<sup>k</sup> Camp. Rat. 3.

6. But where may we heare the voyce, and judgement of the Church? out of doubt either in the writings of the Fathers, or provinciall Synods, or in generall Councils; & in which of these soever the Church speake, her sentence is for us, and our side. Her voyce is but soft & still in the writings of single Fathers; the Church whispereth rather then speaketh in them; and yet even in them shee speaketh this truth very distinctly, and audibly. Heare Saint <sup>l</sup> *Austen*, who entreating of *Cacilianus*, about an hundred yeares after his death, saith; *If as yet they could prove him to have beene guilty of those crimes*, which were by the Donatists objected unto him, *ipsum jam mortuum anathematizavimus*, *I and all Catholikes would even now accurse him though dead*, though never condemned before, nor in his life time. Againe, <sup>m</sup> In this our communion, if there have beene any *Traditores*, or deliverers of the Bible to be burned in time of persecution, when thou shalt demonstrate or prove them to have beene such, *& corde & carne mortuos detestabor*. Heare Pope <sup>n</sup> *Pelagius*, who both himselfe fully assenteth herein to Saint *Austen*, and testifieth the assent of Pope *Leo*, in this manner; *Quis nesciat, who knoweth not that the doctrine of Leo is consonant to Saint Austen*. Heare <sup>o</sup> *S. Cyrill*, who speaking of heretikes, saith, *Evitandi sunt, five in vivis, five in mortuis*; they are to bee avoyded, whether they bee dead, or living.

<sup>l</sup> Epist. ad Bonif. que citatur Cont. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 348. b.

<sup>m</sup> Aug. lib. 3. Cont. Cresc. ca. 35.

<sup>n</sup> Pelag. 2. Epist. 7. 5. In his autem.

<sup>o</sup> Cyr. lib. cont. Theod. cit. 2. Conc. 5. Collat. 8. pa. 385. a.

p Citatur in Conc. 5.  
coll 5. pa. 548 a.

7. The Church speaks yet somewhat louder, in the united judgement of Provinciall Synods. In an *Africane* Councell it was proved, how certaine Bishops at their death had bequeathed their goods to heretikes; whereupon statuerunt, the Bishops in that Synod decreed, ut post mortem anathemati subjiciantur; that such should bee accursed, even after their death; and this *Sextilianus* an *Africane* Bishop testifieth upon his owne certaine knowledge. The judgement of the *Romane* Church is to this purpose most pregnant. About some twenty yeares before this fift Councell, *Dioscorus* was chosen Bishop of *Rome*; but shortly after dying, eum & post mortem anathematizavit *Romana Ecclesia*; the *Romane* Church accursed him even after he was dead, although hee had not offended in the faith, (but in some pecuniary or Symoniack crime) Et hoc sciunt omnes, qui degunt *Roma*; and they all who live at *Rome*, know this to have beene done against him after his death; they especially who are in eminent place, who also continued in the communion with *Dioscorus* untill hee dyed, as after *Iustinian*, *Benignus* Bishop of *Heraclea*, and after them both the fift Councell testifieth. In this very cause of *Theodorus* there was a Synod held in *Armenia*, by *Rambulas* Bishop of *Edeffa*, *Acatius*, and others, wherein, both themselves condemned *Theodorus*, (though dead) and in their letters to *Proclus* exhort him to doe the like.

8. But this voyce of the Church sounds like a mighty thunder in the consenting judgement of generall Councils. In the sixt, *Pope Honorius*, who in his lifetime had not been, was now about threescore yeares after his death, convicted to bee an heretike; and then noviter condemned, and anathematized by the whole Councell. The same sentence of *Anathema* was confirmed, and againe denounced against him in the second *Nicene*; and in the other under *Hadrian*, which they account to be the seventh and eighth generall Councils. In the Councell of *Chalcedon*, *Domnus* Bishop of *Antioch*, was after his death condemned. In the holy *Ephesine* Councell was this very *Theodorus* of *Mopsvestia*, after his death condemned, as *Pope Pelagius* expressly testifieth. The like to have beene done against *Macedonius*, by the fift Councell at *Constantinople*, *Iustinian* declareth. Before that, was the same done by the Councell at *Sardica*, for when some of those, who had subscribed to the *Nicene* faith, returned to *Arianisme*, alij quidem *vivi*, alij autem post mortem anathematizati sunt a *Damaso* Papa, & ab universali *Sardicensi* Synodo; they were anathematized, some while they lived, others after their death, by *Pope Damasus*, and by the generall Councell at *Sardica*, as witnesseth *Athanasius*. With such an uniforme consent doe all these Councils teach this, and teach it, not as any novell doctrine, but as a truth successively from age to age, even from the Apostles time delivered unto them; by warrant of which Apostolical tradition *Valentinus*, *Martian*, *Basilides*, a nulla Synodo anathematizati, being by no Synod in their life time condemned, were after their death accursed by the Church of God.

9. And

q Iust. Edict. § Invenimus.  
r Conc. 5. Coll. 5.  
pa. 549. a.  
s Coll. 8. pa. 585. b.  
t Bar. an. 435. nu. 4

u Petimus quatenus fiat unitas vestra contra Theodorum, & sacrilega Dogmata ejus. In Libell. Presbyt. Armē. ad Procl. in Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 541. b.  
x Act. 12. 13. 18.  
y Act. 7. in Epistola 2. Synod. & Can. 1.  
z Honorius post mortem ab Orientis Episcopis anathematizatus est officio.  
Conc. 8. Act. 7. pa. 891. b.  
a Edict. Justin. § Quod autem & Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 575. b.  
b Pelag. 2. Epist. § In his.  
c Sancta Dei Ecclesia & post mortem Macedonium anathematizavit.  
Iust. Edict. § Quod a Ibidem.

e Conc. 5. Coll. 5.  
pa. 549. a.

9. And yet if none of all these particulars could bee produced, seeing the doctrine of the faith decreed in this fifth Councell, (one part whereof is this of *condemning the dead*) is consonant to all the former, and confirmed by all succeeding Councils, (as we did before demonstrate) nor Councils only, but approved by all Popes, and Bishops, from *Gregory* the first, to *Leo* the tenth, yea, by all Catholikes whatsoever, who all, by approving this fifth Councell, consent in this truth; Seeing all these, that is, the whole Catholike Church, for 1500 yeares, with one consenting voyce, found out, like a multitude of mighty waters, this Catholike truth, which *Vigilius* oppugneth, *that one may after his death be noviter condemned*, and found it as a doctrine of the Catholike faith, and even thereby found out Pope *Vigilius* to have held, yea, to have defined heresie; and all, who defend *Vigilius*, to bee hereticall; I do nothing doubt, but if ever you did, or can, you doe now most distinctly heare the voyce of the Church, even of that Church, of which their *Romane Rabscha* vaunteth, that we are marvellously affrighted at the very name thereof.

10. May I now intreate, that as you have heard the Church, so you would be pleased to heare what the Cardinall doth say of this matter. After this part of *Vigilius* decree, he sets a memorable glosse upon the Popes text. *Hic adverte, Note here*, saith the Cardinall, that this assertion of *Vigilius* (*that dead men ought not to be condemned*) is not so generally received as it is set downe by him. A worthy note indeed out of a Cardinals mouth; *Papa hic non renetur*. But I pray you, by whom is it not received? The Cardinall answers, not by the holy Church; *the holy Church & doth practise the contrary unto it*. What? the holy Church not receive the dogmaticall and Apostolicall assertion of the holy Pope? not that assertion which his Holinesse decreeth to be taught by Scripture, to be a *Constitution*, a rule, a definition of the holy Apostolike See? Not truly; The holy Church for all that, receives not this assertion, saith the Cardinall. And the Cardinall was to blame to use such a palpable *usurpation*. The Church receiveth it not: hee might, and he should have said; *The holy Church rejecteth, condemneth, and accurseth this Cathedrall assertion of the Pope, and all that defend it: nor the Church onely of that one age wherein Vigilius lived, but the Catholike Church of all ages speaking by the mouthes of all general Councils, of Fathers, of Popes, of all Catholikes, this holy Church condemneth and accurseth the assertion of Pope Vigilius*. The Cardinall was too diminutive in his extenuations, when he spake so faintly, The holy Church doth not so generally receive it.

11. Let us beare with the Cardinals tendernes of heart: the Popes sores must not be touched, but with soft, and tender hands. Seeing the Cardinall hath brought the Pope, and the holy Church to be at odds, and at an unreconciliable contradiction; the Pope denying, the Church affirming, *that a man after his death may noviter be condemned*, it is well worth the labour to

f Bar. an. 553. nu.  
135.

g Huiusmodi hominē  
iure damnare  
post mortem sancta  
consuevit Ecclesia.  
Bar. ibid.



examine, whether part the Cardinall himselfe will take in this quarrell; you may be sure, the choyce on either part was very hard for him: he hath here a worse matter than a wolfe by the eares. This is *dignus vindice nodus*, a point which will trie the Cardinals art, wisdom, piety, constancy, and faire dealing: And in very deed, he hath herein plaid *Sir Politike* would be, above the degree of commendation. The Cardinall is a man of peace, hee loves not to displease either the Pope, or the Church; he knew, that to provoke either of them, would bring an armie of waspes about his eares; and therefore very gravely, wisely, and discretely he takes part with them both: and though their assertions bee directly contradictory, he holds them both to be true, and takes up an hymne of *Omnia bene* to them both.

h Bar. an. 553.  
nu. 185.

12. First, he sheweth that the Church saith right, in this manner: *Although it is proved, that one dyed in the peace of the Church, and yet it doe afterwards appeare, that in his writings he defended a condemned heresie, and continuing in that heresie died therein, and but dissimblingly communicate with the Church, the holy Church useth to condemne such a man, jure, even by right.* Having said as much as can bee wished, on the Churches part, the Cardinall will now teach, that the Pope also saith right, in this manner; Pope *Vigilius* had many worthy reasons for his defense of the Three Chapters, by his Constitution; and among those worthy reasons this is one: for if this were once admitted, that a man who dyeth in the communion of the Church, might after his death be condemned; *pateret ostium*, this would open such a gap, that every ecclesiasticall writer, though hee dyed in the Catholike Communion, may yet after his death, out of his writings be condemned for an heretike. Thus *Baronius*.

h Bar. an. 553. nu.  
233.

13. O what a golden and blessed age was this, that brought forth such a Cardinall! The Church decreeth, that a man after his death, may noviter be condemned for an heretike; and it decreeth aright: The Pope decreeth the quite contrary, that no man after his death may noviter be condemned for an heretike; and hee also decreeth aright, and with good reason. So both the Church saith well, & the Pope saith well; & you can say no lesse then, *Et vitulatu dignus, & hic*: or because the Cardinall saith better than they both, and what *Jupiter* himselfe could never doe, makes two contradictory sayings to be both true, and both said well; heo best deserveth, let him have all the prize, *Vitula in dignus utraque*.

14. I told you before, and this ensuing treatise will make it as cleare as the Sunne, that *Baronius* having once lost the path, & forsaken that truth, where only sure footing was to be found, wandereth up and downe, in and out in this cause, as in a wilderness, treading on nothing but thornes; wherewith feeling himselfe prickt, he skips hither and thither for succour, but still lights on briars and brambles, which doe not onely gally, but so intangle him, that by no meanes he can ever extricate, or unwind himselfe;

himselfe; for if one list to make sport with the Cardinall, it clearly and certainly followeth, that if the Church say true, then the Pope saying the contrary, doth say untrue. Again, if the Pope say true, then the Church saying the contrary, doth say untrue; and then upon the Cardinals saying that they both say true, it certainly followeth, that neither of them both say true, and yet further, that both of them, say both true and untrue, and yet that neither of them both saith either truth, or untruth.

15. But leaving the Cardinall in these bryars, seeing by the upright, and unpartiall judgement of the whole Catholike Church of all ages, we have proved the Popes decree herein to be erroneous, and (because it is in a cause of faith) heretical, let us a little examine the two reasons on which *Vigilius* groundeth this his assertion: The former is taken from those words of our Saviour, <sup>k</sup> *whatsoever ye binde on earth*, whence, as you have seene, *Vigilius*, and, as he saith, *Gelasius* also collecteth, that such as are not on earth or alive, cannot be judged by the Church. k Math. 18. 18.

16. The answer is not hard; our Saviours words, being well considered, are so farre from concluding, what *Vigilius* or *Gelasius*, or both, doe thence collect, that they clearly and certainly doe enforce the quite contrary; for he said not, Whatsoever yee binde, or loose, concerning those that are on earth, or living; in which sense *Vigilius* tooke them: but, Whatsoever concerning either the living or dead, ye my Apostles, and your successors being upon earth, or during your life time, shall binde or loose, the same according to your censure here passed upon earth, shall by my authority bee ratified in heaven. The restrictive termes [*upon earth*] are referred to the parties, who doe binde, or loose; not to the parties, who are bound, or loosed. The generall terme [*whatsoever*] is referred to the parties who are bound, or loosed, whether they be dead, or alive, not to the parties who binde or loose, who are onely alive, and upon earth. Nor doth our Saviour say, Whatsoever yee seeme to binde or loose here upon earth, shall bee bound or loosed in heaven; for, (*ecclesia clave errante*) no censure doth, or can either binde, or loose, either the quicke or the dead: but he saith, Whatsoever ye doe binde or loose, if the party be once truly and really bound, or loosed, by you that are upon earth, it shall stand firme, and bee ratified by my selfe in heaven. So the parties who doe binde, or loose, are the Apostles, and their successors onely while they are upon earth: the parties who are bound, or loosed, are any whosoever whether alive or dead; the partie who ratifieth their act in binding and loosing, is *Christ* himselfe in heaven; For I say unto you, whatsoever ye binde on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever yee loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.

17. This exposition is clearly warranted by the judgement of the whole catholike Church, which, as we have before declared, both beleevèd, taught, and practised this authority of binding,

1 *Aff. conciliab.*  
Ephef. citata in ac-  
tis Conc. Chalced. *Aff.*  
1. pa. 57. b.

in *Cefuo Flaviano*  
*dolore plagarum*  
*migravit ad Do-*  
*minum.* lib. ca. 12.

n *Que* (Synodus  
Chalc.) *Flaviano*  
*palmam mortis tri-*  
*buit gloriosa.*  
*Edict. Valen. &*  
*Mart. in Chalced.*  
*Conc. A. B. 4. pa. 36.*  
*a. & Flaviano in-*  
*juste quidem in vi-*  
*ta condemnatus,*  
*juste post mortem*  
*revocatus est a B.*  
*Leme et sancta Sy-*  
*nodo Chalcedonensi.*  
*Iust. edict. S. Inve-*  
*nimus.*

o *Hist. combustio-*  
*nis Bucerii et Fagii*  
*et restitutionis eo-*  
*rum.*

p *Si non oporteret*  
*anathematizari*  
*post mortem eos qui*  
*in sua impietate*  
*mortui sunt, oportet*  
*has nec eos qui in-*  
*juste condemnati*  
*sunt patres post*  
*mortem revocari.*  
*Iust. edict. prope*  
*finem.*

and loosing, not onely upon the living, but upon the dead also. Of their binding the nocent, wee have alleaged before abundance of examples: for their loosing the innocent, that one of *Flavianus* is sufficient. The *Ephesine* <sup>1</sup> *latrocinie* adjudged and condemned *Flavianus* a most holy and Catholike Bishop, for an Hereticke; under the censure of that generall Councel *Flavianus* died, nay was martyred<sup>m</sup> by them: The holy Councell at *Chalcedon* after the death of *Flavianus*, loosed that band, wherewith the latrocinious conspirators at *Ephesus*, thought they had fast tyed him, but because their key did erre, they did not in truth. They honored and proclaimed *Flavianus* for a Saint and Martyr<sup>n</sup>, whom the faction of *Dioscorus* had murdered for an heretike: the holy Councell feared not to loose him, because he was dead, & their power to binde, or loose, was onely towards those that are upon the earth, or living. By which example, and warrantie of that holy Councell, our Church of latter time, imitating the religious pietie of those ancient Bishops, restored to their *pristine* <sup>o</sup> *dignitie* and honor those reverend Martyrs, two *Flavians* in their age, *Bucer* and *Fagius* after their death; when a worse then that *Ephesine* conspiracy had not onely with an erring key bound, but even burned them to ashes. Now it is rightly observed by *Iustinian* <sup>v</sup>, that if the Church may after their death, restore such as being unjustly condemned, and falsely supposed to be bound, died in their innocency, and sincerity of faith: it may also by the very same reason, condemn, and anathematize such after their death, who died in their impiety or heresie, being charitably perhaps but falsely supposed, to have died in the communion of the Catholike Church.

18. And truly, whether soever of these censures; either of binding, or loosing, the Church useth towards the dead, as they both are warranted by the words of Christ, and judgement of the Church, so in doing either of both, they performe an acceptable service to God, and an holy duty to the Church of God. For as wee profess in our Creed to beleeve the *Communion* of Saints, which in part consisteth in loving, praising, and imitating all such as we know, either now to live, or heretofore to have dyed in the faith; or for the faith of Christ: so doe wee by the same Article of our Creed, renounce all communion with whatsoever heretickes, either dead or alive, and therefore though in their life time, they had never beene condemned for such, but honored as the servants of God, under whose livery they hide their heresies, and impieties; yet so soone as ever they shall be manifested to have beene indeed, and to have died heretickes, we ought forthwith to forsake all communion with them, not love them, nor speake well of them, much lesse imitate them; but as Saint *Austen* saith he would doe of *Casibianus*, even after their death, *corde & carne anathematizare*, not making them accursed; (For that the Church cannot do, and themselves have done that already) but declaring them to be accursed, & in truth excluded from



from the society of God, & Gods Church; and to be such though dead, as with whom we can have no more cōmunion, then hath light with darknesse, faith with heresie, God and Beliall; nay we should wish that if it were possible, there might be such an antipathie, and disunion betwixt us and them, as is said to have been betwixt *Eteocles* 4, and *Polinices*, that even our dead bones, and ashes, might leape from theirs, nor sleepe in one Church, nor one earth with them, from whom one day they shall be eternally severed, by a wall of immortality and immortall glory.

q Impositis eorum  
cadaveribus eidem  
rogo, flammam se  
divisisse traditur,  
vid. Stat. in 7 heb.

19. *Vigilius* his second reason is taken from the rules, decrees and *Constitutions* 5 of their *Apostolicke* See, by name of Pope *Leo*, & *Gelasius*, both whō *Vigilius* saith to have defined this, that a dead man might not noviter be condemned: was it not enough for *Vigilius*, that himselfe was hereticall herein, unlesse he drew his predecessors also into the same crime, of defending, yea defining heresies? How much better had it becomed him, to have covered such hereticall blemishes of their *Apostolike* See, and of so famous Bishops as *Leo* and *Gelasius* were, if not with a lappe of his robe, as the good *Emperour* would, yet at least with silence and oblivion.

r Idem regulariter  
Apostolice sedis de-  
finitum constituta.  
Vigil. loc. citat. in  
179.

20. And yet for all this, if *Vigilius* and the defenders of his infallibility, will give me leave, I am for my owne part willing to thinke better, and more favourably of *Leo*, and *Gelasius*, in this matter: specially of *Leo*, whose authority, when some defenders of the three Chapters objected 6 to Pope *Pelagius*, as according with them, *Pelagius* replied not onely that hee could no where remember any such thing in the bookes of *Leo*, but that *Leo* indeed taught the quite contrary, as consenting 7 wholly with Saint *Augustine*, who professed, that he would anathematize *Cacilianus* after his death, if it could appeare that he were guilty of those crimes. Which testimony of *Pelagius* as it fully cleareth *Leo* of this heresie, so doth it manifest how unjustly *Vigilius* pretendeth his consent with him in this cause, yea and the words of *Leo*, which hee citeth, doe declare no lesse. 8 In that Epistle 9 *Leo* intreating of those who by the just censure of the Church, were excommunicated, or who did not performe the acts required in repentance, saith, If any of them die before hee obtaine remission, *quod manens in corpore non receperit, consequi exutus carne non poterit*, hee cannot obtaine that. (to wit, remission of his fault) being dead, which before his death he had not received: And upon these follow the words cited by *Vigilius*. Neither is it needfull that we shold sift the merits or acts of them, *qui sic obierunt*, who so die, seeing our Lord hath reserved to his justice, what the priestly ministerie could not performe, (to wit, the loosing of that band of censure or of sinne, under which they dyed.) Thus *Leo*, who denieth not that men after their death may be condemned, but that any who in his life time is not, may after his death be pardoned; Hee speakes not of such as have not beene in their life time condemned, of which onely *Vigilius* entreateth, but of such, who being unpenitent

5 Premissis di-  
centis, doctrina  
vestra reverenda  
sedis est, per B. Leo-  
nem Successoresq;  
ejus, mortuum ab  
hominibus damna-  
ri nullatenus oportere. Pelag. 2. Epist.  
7. S. In his.  
8 Quis nescit quod  
ejusdem Leonis &  
B. Augustini præ-  
dicatio contradicat,  
ibid  
9 Leo Epist. 91.

unpenitent, or condemned by the Church, die in their sin, or under that just censure, & therefore in the state of condemnation: So neither doe the words of *Leo* signifie any such thing, as *Vigilius* by them intended to prove: and Pope *Pelagius* assureth us, that *Leo* taught the quite contrary to that, which out of *Leo*, *Vigilius* in vaine labourereth to prove.

21. The very like construction is to bee given of the words of *Gelasius* in both the places cited out of him by *Vigilius*. In the former,<sup>x</sup> entreating of *Acatius*, he thus saith, *Let no man perswade you that Acatius is freed from the crime of his prevarication; for after he had falne into that wickednesse, and deserved to be excluded, and that, jure, by right, from the Apostolike communion, in hac eadem persistens damnatione defunctus est, hee persisting in this condemnation dyed; Absolution cannot bee now granted unto him being dead, which he neither desired, nor deserved while he lived: for it was said to the Apostles, Whatsoever yee binde on earth: But of him (these are the words cited by Vigilius) who is now under Gods indgement, (that is, who is dead in this sort) it is not lawfull for us to decree ought else; but that, in quo eum supremus dies invenit, wherein hee was found at the time of his death. So Gelasius. In which words it is evident that hee speaks not (as Vigilius doth) of such as in their life time were not condemned, nor denieth hee that such may after their death (when their heresie is discovered) be condemned, but of such as being in their life time justly condemned, dye impenitent in that estate, and of such he denyeth, that after their death they can be absolved. A truth so cleare, that *Binius* sets this marginall note upon it, Qui impenitens mortuus est excommunicatus, post mortem non potest absolvi; He who dieth impenitent under the censure of excommunication, cannot after his death bee absolved. And *Gelasius* himselfe often repeateth the same most clearly, in his *Commonitorium* to *Faustus*: We reade saith he y, that *Christ* raised up some from the dead, but we never reade, that he forgave, or absolved any who were impenitent when they dyed: and this power he gave to *Peter*, Whatsoever thou shalt binde on earth: on earth saith he, nam in hac ligatione defunctum nusquam dixit absolvi; For *Christ* never said that any who dyed being so bound should be loosed.*

x *Epist. Synodalis Gelasij, & Synod. Rom. 2. p. 268. b.*

a *Not etiam mortui veniam prestare deposcunt. ibid.*

22. The same is his meaning also in the other place<sup>z</sup> alleauged by *Vigilius*; In it he intreateth of *Vitalis* and *Misennus*, who being the Popes Legates, had communicated with *Acatius*, and other hereticall sectaries, and were for that cause both of them excommunicated by Pope *Felix* the next predecessor of *Gelasius*; *Misennus* repenting was received into the communion of the Church: *Vitalis* remaining impenitent died under that just censure: when some of *Vitalis* friends desired the like absolution for *Vitalis* being dead<sup>a</sup>, *Gelasius* utterly refused to grant it, and calling a *Romane Synode*, it was declared in it; That *Misennus* ought in right to be loosed, but not *Vitalis*, whom, as they professed, they gladly would, but by reason of his owne impenitency wherein he dyed, they could not helpe, nor absolve, but

but must leave him (which are the words on which *Vigilius* relyeth) to the judgement of God, it being impossible for them to absolve him being dead, seeing it is said, Whatsoever ye shall bind upon earth, such then as are not upon earth, God hath reserved, whom not to man, but to his owne judgement; Nor dare the Church challenge this unto it: So *Gelasius* and the whole Romane Synode, who doe not here generally deny, that any without exception may be judged being dead; for then they should condemne besides many other, the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, which absolved *Flavianus*, and bound or condemned *Dionysius*, and both after their deaths: but limiting their speech to the present matter which they handled, they teach that none who are dead (to wit in such state as *Vitalis* dyed, excommunicated and impenitent,) nor such can after their death be judged (to wit in such sort as the favourers of *Vitalis* would have had him adjudged, that is, absolved or loosed after his death from that censure;) and that the words of our Saviour doe forcibly conclude, seeing whatsoever is bound upon earth is also bound in heaven, and seeing such as die in that just bond of the Church, are indeed reserved to the onely judgement of God, the Church can pronounce no other, nor milder sentence, then it hath already passed of them: That none at all after their death may be condemned by the Church, *Gelasius* saith not, and that is the hereticall position which *Vigilius* should out of *Gelasius*, but doth not prove: That none who at their death are justly bound by the Church, and dye impenitent therein, can after their death be loosed by the Church, is a catholike truth, which *Gelasius* teacheth, and we all professe, this *Vigilius* firmly by *Gelasius* doth, but should not prove.

23. So willing am I to quit Pope *Leo* and *Gelasius* from that hereticall doctrine wherewith *Vigilius* by his Apostolicall decree hath not onely himselfe eternally blemished the Romane See, but laboureth also to fasten that heresie, as an ancient and hereditarie doctrine from the time of *Leo* unto their See. If this my indeavour, for the honor of *Leo* and *Gelasius* be not accepted by them, I must returne a conditionall and shorter, but more unpleasing answer to this second reason of *Vigilius*, relying on their authority, and that is this, If *Leo* and *Gelasius* truly and indeed taught the same with *Vigilius*, that none after their death may noviter be condemned, then were they also as *Vigilius*, by the consenting judgement of the catholike Church, hereticall: If they did not indeed teach this doctrine, then is *Vigilius* not onely erroneous in faith, both decreeing himselfe, and judging them to have decreed heresie, but slanderous also, falsely imputing so great a crime as is heresie, to so ancient & famous Popes as were *Gelasius* and *Leo*: And so whether they taught this doctrine, or taught it not, this second reason of *Vigilius* is of no worth at all, proving nothing else, but either them to be hereticall, if *Vigilius* say true, or himselfe to be a slanderer, if he say untrue.



24. Now after the reasons of *Vigilius* fully refuted, in head of a conclusion, I will adde one short consideration to all that hath beene said, That this position decared by *Vigilius* is such, as doth not onely condemne the catholike church, that is, all the oppugners of it, but even *Vigilius* himselfe, and all who defend it. Say you, that a dead man may not *noviter* be condemned. In saying so you condemne the holy Councell at *Sardica*, of *Constantinople*, of *Ephesus*, of *Chalcedon*, for they all did *noviter* condemne such persons being dead, as in their lifestime had not beene condemned. Now the holy Fathers of those Councells, having thus condemned the dead, dyed themselves in the Lord, and were in peace gathered to the Lord. If you say, they should not have condemned the dead, even in saying so you doe *noviter* condemne all those Fathers being now dead; and so you doe that same thing, which you say must not bee done; and even by defending your position, you overthrow your owne position; for you doe *noviter* condemne all those holy Fathers being dead; and yet you say, that no man may *noviter* condemne the dead: Nay, you condemne not them only, but even your own selfe also herein, for you condemne those, who condemne the dead, and yet your selfe condemnes all those holy Fathers, being now dead, and you condemne them for doing that, which your selfe now doe, even for condemning the dead. Such a strange discord there is in this hereticall position of *Vigilius*, that it not only fights against the truth, and the opposites unto it, but viper-like, even against it selfe, and against the favourers, and defenders of it.

## CAP. VII.

That the second reason of *Vigilius* touching the first Chapter, why *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia* ought not to be condemned, because he dyed in the peace and communion of the Church, is erroneous and untrue.

**T**HE second reason of *Vigilius*, why *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia* should not bee condemned, is, for that (as he supposeth) *Theodorus* dyed in the peace and communion of the Church: to this purpose he saith, that the rules of his predecessors (which he applyeth to *Theodorus*) did keep inviolate the persons of Bishops, in pace Ecclesiastica defunctorum, who dyed in the peace of the Church. And again, We doe especially provide by this our present Constitution, lest by occasion of perverse doctrine, any thing be derogated from the persons of them, who, as we have said, in pace & communion universalis Ecclesie quieverunt; have dyed in the peace and communion of the Catholike Church, and that no contumelie be done to those Bishops, qui in pace Catholica Ecclesia

*in Vigil. Const. apud Bar. an. 553. nu. 179.*

*ibid. nu. 184.*

*sic sunt defuncti, who have dyed in the peace of the Catholike Church.*

Now that *Theodorus* so dyed *Vigilius* proveth not, but takes as consequent upon the former point, which, as we have shewed, was knowne and confessed, because he was not in his life time condemned by the Church. Nor was *Vigilius* the first founder of this reason, he borrowed it of other Nestorians, with whom in this cause he was joyned both in hand and heart. They (to wit, the followers of *Theodorus* and *Nestorius*) flee unto another vaine excuse, saith *Iustinian*, affirming that *Theodorus* ought not to be condemned, *quod in communione Ecclesiarum mortuus est*; because he dyed in the communion of the Churches.

c Sup. ap. 6.  
d Peispermus si  
quid de his qui de-  
functi sunt, & mi-  
nime reperiuntur in  
vita damnati. Vig.  
loc. cit. nu. 176.  
Quos vocat, In pa-  
ce Ecclesia defun-  
ctos. Ibid. nu. 179.  
e 184.  
c Iust. Edict.  
S Quod autem.

2. I shall not need to stay long in refuting this reason of *Vigilius*: The Emperour hath done it most soundly, and that before ever *Vigilius* writ his Constitution. *Oportebat* eas scire, those men who plead thus for *Theodorus*, should know that they dye in the communion of the Church, who unto their very death doe hold that common doctrine of piety which is received in the whole Church. *Iste autem usque ad mortem in sua permanens impietate, ab omni Ecclesia reiectus est*; but this *Theodorus* continuing in his impiety to his death, was rejected by the whole Church. Thus *Iustinian*. To whose true testimonie *Binius* ascribeth so much as well he might, that whereas some reported of *Theodorus* that he recalled his heresie, this, saith he, might be believed, *nisi Iustinianus*, unless the Emperour had testified that he dyed in his heresie.

f Iust. Ibid.

g Bin. Notis in  
Conc. 5. verbo Theo-  
dorus.  
h Conc. 5. Coll. 5.  
pa. 552. a.

3. The same is clearly witnessed also in the fifth Councell, where, as it were of purpose, this reason of *Vigilius* is refuted in this manner: *Whereas it is said of some* (and one of those is *Vigilius*) *that Theodorus died in the peace and communion of the Church, mendacium est & calumnia, magis adversus Ecclesiam*; this is a lie and slander, and that especially to the Church. For he is said to die in the communion and peace of the Church, *qui usque ad mortem recte Ecclesia dogmata servavit*; who hath kept and held the true doctrines of faith, even till his death: But that *Theodorus* did not keepe those doctrines, *certum est*, it is certaine by his blasphemies: and *Gregory Nissen* witnesseth the same. And after the words of *Gregory* recited, they adde this, *quomodo conantur dicere, how doe any say*, that such an impious and blasphemous person as *Theodorus* was, dyed in the communion of the Church? Thus testifieth the Councell.

4. Can ought be wished more pregnant to manifest the foule errors of *Vigilius* in this part of his decree? *Vigilius* affirmeth that *Theodorus* dyed in the peace and communion of the Catholike Church: The Emperour and Councell not onely testifie the contrary, but for this very cause the Councell (impatient at such indignitie offered to Gods Church,) calls him in plaine termes a lyar, and a slanderer, yea, a slanderer of the whole Catholike Church in so saying. *Vigilius* from the not condemning of *Theodorus* in his life time, collecteth, that hee dyed in the peace and communion

communion of the Church: both the Emperour and Councell witnesse his doctrinall error herein: truly teaching, that though an heretike live all his life time; not onely uncondemned by the Church, but in all outward pompe, honour, and applause of the Church, either himselfe cunningly cloaking, or the Church not curiously, and warily observing his heresie while hee liveth; yet such a man neither lives, nor dyes in the intire peace and communion of the Church. The Church hath such peace with none, who have not peace with God; nor communion with any, who have not union with Christ. It condemned him not; because, as it teacheth others, so it selfe judgeth most charitably of all: It judged him to be such, as hee seemed, and professed himselfe to bee. It was not his person, but his profession, with which the Church in his life time had communion and peace. As soone as ever it seeth him not to bee indeed such as hee seemed to bee, it renounceth all peace and communion with him, whether dead, or alive; nay, rather it forsaketh not her communion with him, but declareth unto all, that shee never had communion or peace with this man, such as hee was indeed before, though she had peace with such as he seemed to bee. Shee now denounceth a double anathema against him, condemning him first for beleiving or teaching heresie, and then for covering his heresie under the visor of a Catholike, and of the Catholike faith. So justly and fully doth the Emperour, and Councell refuse, both the personall error of *Vigilius* in that hee affirmeth *Theodorus* to have dyed in the peace of the Church, and the doctrinall also, in that he affirmeth it upon this ground, that in his life time hee was not condemned by the Church.

3 Accesserunt digna  
causa ac ratio-  
nes. Bar. an. 553.  
nu. 333.

5. Now whereas *Baronius* saith, that *Vigilius* had just, and worthy reasons to defend this first Chapter: one of which is this, because, if this were once admirted that one dying in the communion of the Church, might after his death be condemned for an heretike; *pateret ostium*, there would a gap be opened, that every ecclesiasticall writer, *licet in communione Catholica defunctus esset*; although hee dyed in the communion of the Catholike Church, might after death be out of his writings condemned, for an heretike; truly hee feareth where no feare is at all. This gap, nay, this gate and broad street of condemning the dead hath laine wide open this sixteen hundred years. Can the Cardinall, or any of his friends in all these successiōs of ages, wherein have dyed many thousand millions of Catholikes, can he name or finde but so much as *one* who hath truly dyed in the peace and communion of the Church, and yet hath beene after his death condemned by the Catholike Church for an heretike? He cannot. The Church should condemne her owne selfe, if shee condemned any with whom she had peace, and whom she embraceth in her holy communion, which is no other but the society with God. Such indeed may dye in some error, yea, in an error of faith, as *Papias*, *Irinee*,



*Irenee, Iustine*, in that of the millenaries: as *Cyprian*, (as is likely) and other Africane Bishops in that of *Rebaptization*; but either dye heretikes, or be after their death condemned by the Catholike Church, for heretikes, they cannot.

6. But there is most just cause why the Cardinall, and all his fellowes, should feare another matter, which more acerely concerns themselves; and feare it, even upon that Catholike position, that the dead out of their writings may justly bee condemned. They should feare to have such an itching humour to write in the Popes Cause, for his supremacy of authority, or *infallibility* of his *Cathedrall* judgement: feare to stuffe their Volumes (as the Cardinall hath done his *Annals*) with heresies, and oppositions against the faith; feare to continue and persist in their hereticall doctrine: feare to die before they have attained to that which is *secunda post naufragium sabula*; the second and onely boord to save them after their shipwracke; to dye I say, before they revoked, disclaimed, condemned, or beene the first men to set fire to their hereticall doctrines and writings; and at least, in words, if not, as the<sup>t</sup> custome was, by oath, and handwriting, so testifie to the Church, their desire to returne unto her bosome. These are the things indeed they ought to feare, knowing that howsoever they flatter themselves with the vaine name of the Church, yet in very truth, so long as their writings remaine, testifying that they defended the Popes *infallibility* in defying causes of faith, or any other doctrine relying on that ground, whereof in their life time they have not made a certaine, and knowne recantation, they neither lived nor dyed in the peace and communion of the Catholike Church, but may at any time after their death, and ought whosoever occasio is offered, be declared by the Church to have dyed in their heresies; and therefore dyed both out of the peace of God, and of the holy Church of God. This, unless they seriously and sincerely performe, it is not I, nor any of our writers, (whom they imagine, but most unjustly, out of spleene and contention to speake these things) who condemne them, but it is the whole Catholike Church; Shee, by approving this last Councell and the true decree therof, condemns this *Apostolicall* & *Cathedrall* definition of *Vigilius*, and all that defend it; that is, all the members of the present Romane Church, to be hereticall; and as convicted heretikes, she declares them to be anathematized; that is, utterly separated from God, and from the peace, and most blessed communion with the Church of God; howsoever they boast themselves to be the onely children of the Church of God.

7. If any shall here reply, or thinke, that by the former examples of *Papias, Irenee, Iustine, Cyprian*, and the rest, *Baronius*, and other members of the present Romane church may be excused; that these also, as the former, though dying in their error, may dye in the peace & communion of the Church; this I confesse is a friendly, but no firme excuse; for although they are both alike in this,

k In fine vite reconciliatio petentibus et penitentibus non est neganda, dum tamen, si heretici sint, recipiantur cum scriptura & juramento.

Gloss in dist. 1. de penit. ca. Multiplex. 1 Satis est ut Ecclesia iudicio constet aliquem decessisse impenitentem, si non constet de illius penitentia, qui hereticus post mortem convictus est. Fran. Torrens. lib. de 6, 7, & 8. Synod. p. 13. & ejusdem sententia ait Paph. fuisse.

that the former as well as the latter, dye in an error of faith, yet is there extreme odds, and many cleare dissimilitudes, betwixt the state or condition of the one, and the other.

8. The first ariseth from the *matter it selfe wherein they erre*. The former erred in that doctrine of faith, wherein the truth was not *eliquata, declarata, & solidata per plenum Concilium*, as *S. Austen*<sup>m</sup> speaketh, not fully scanned, declared, & confirmed by a plenary Councell: Had it bin, we may well think the very same of all those holy men, which *Austen*<sup>n</sup> most charitably saith of *S. Cyprian*, *Sine dubio, universi orbis auctoritate patefacta veritate cessissent, without doubt they would have yealded to the truth, being manifested unto them, by the auctority of the whole Church*. The latter erre in that, which, to use same Fathers<sup>o</sup> words, *per universa Ecclesia statuta firmatum est; which hath bene strenghtened by the decree of the whole Church*. This fifth Councell, consonant to all precedent, and confirmed by all subsequent generall Councils, unto *Leo* the tenth, decreeing this cathedrall sentence of Pope *Vigilius*, to bee hereticall: whence it doth clearly ensue, that as the former, who were ready to embrace the truth, had it beene manifested unto them, erred not of pertinacy, but as *Austen* saith, of humane infirmitie, so the latter, who reject the truth being manifested unto them, and withstand the knowne judgement of the whole catholike Church, even that judgement which is testified by all those witnesses, to be consonant to the Scriptures, and Apostolicall doctrine, can no way be excused from most wilfull and pertinacious obstinacy, seeing they adhere to that opinion, which themselves, or their particular church hath chosen, though they see, and know the same to be repugnant to Scripture, & the consenting judgement of all generall and holy Councils, that is, of the whole catholike Church. So the error of the former, though it was in a point of faith, yet was but materially to be called heresie, as being a doctrine repugnant to faith, yet being not joyned in them with pertinacy, which is essentially, as *Canon*<sup>p</sup> sheweth, required in an heretike, could neither make, nor denominate them to be heretikes. The error of the latter, is not onely an error in a point of faith, but is formally to bee called heresie, such as being both a doctrine repugnant to faith, and being in them joyned with pertinacy, doth both make, and truly denominate them, who so erre, to be heretikes, and shew them to hold it heretically, not onely as an error, but as a most proper heresie.

9. The second difference is in the *manner of their error*. The former held their opinions as probable collections, not as undoubted doctrines of faith; and so long as those errors were so held, the Church suspended her judgement, both concerning the doctrines, and the persons. And this was at least untill the time of *Jerome*, touching the millenary opinion; for he mentio-  
ning the same, saith thus, *Hac licet non sequamur, tamen damnare non possumus, quia multi Ecclesiasticorum virorum & martyrum ista dixerunt:*

m Aug. lib. 2. de  
bapt. ca. 4.

n Ibid.

o Aug. lib. eod. c. 1.

p Quod heresis est  
sine pertinacia ne-  
quitate, non est diffi-  
cile ostendere cum  
omnium Tricolo-  
rorum sententia,  
&c. Canon lib. 12.  
Loc. Tricol. ca. 9.  
§ Quod.

q Sancta Ecclesia  
aliquandiu de ea re  
superfedit, judi-  
cium suspendit Bar.  
notus in Martyr. in  
Febr. 22. voce  
Papae.  
r Hier. in cap. 19.  
Jeremie.

*dixerunt* : These things (concerning the raigne of Christ for one thousand yeares upon earth, in a terrestriall, but yet a golden Ierusalem) although we doe not our selves follow, yet wee cannot condemne them, because many of the Ecclesiasticall writers and Martyrs have said the same : whereby it is evident, that in *Ieromes* time nothing was defined herein by the Church; for then *Ierome* might, and would constantly have condemned that error by the warrant of the Churches authoritie, which then hee held to bee a probable, and disputable matter. In which regard also *Austen* calleth it a tolerable opinion, and such as himselfe had sometimes held, if the delights of the Saints in that time be supposed to be spirituall. *Baronius* tels us, (how rightly I will not now examine,) that when *Apollinarius* renewed this opinion, and urged it, *ut dogma Catholicum*, no longer as a matter of probability, but as a Catholike doctrine of faith; It was then condemned by Pope *Damasus* about the time of *Ierome*; and so being condemned by the Church, it was ever after that held for an heresie; and the defenders of it, for heretikes.

*1 Hieronimi tempore nihil adhuc ab Ecclesia de eâ re fuit definitum. Bar. notis in Martyr. loc. cit.*

*2 Que opinio esset utcumq. tolerabilis, si, &c. Aug. lib. 20. de Civit. Dei. ca 7. u. Bar. an. 118. m. 2. et an. 373. m. 14*

10. Did *Baronius* and the rest of the Romane Church in like sort, as those millenary Fathers, commend their Popes infallibility no otherwise then as a probable, a topicall, or disputable matter, the like favourable censure would not be denied unto them, but that they also, notwithstanding that error in faith, might die in the communion of the Church. But when Pope *Vigilius* published his Apostolicall Constitution, as a doctrine with such necessity to be received of all, that none either by word or writing might contradict the same; when the chiefe Pillers of their Church urge the Popes Cathedrall definitions in causes of faith, for such as wherein, *nullo casu errare potest, he can by no possibilitie bee deceived, or teach amisse*; when they urge this, not onely as *Apollinarius* did the other, *ut dogma Catholicum*, as a doctrine of faith; but as the foundation of all the doctrines of faith; It was high time for the Catholike Church, as soone as they espied this, to creepe into the hearts of men, to give some soveraigne antidote against such poyson, and to prevent that deluge of heresies, which they knew, if this Cataraſt were set open, would at once rush in, and overwhelm the Church of God. And therefore the fift generall, and holy Councell, to preserve for ever the faith of the Church against this heresie, did not onely condemne it, decreeing the Apostolicall and cathedrall sentence of Pope *Vigilius* to be hereticall; but decreed all the defenders of it to be accursed, and separated from God, and Gods Church; so that whosoever after this sentence and decree of the holy Synod, approved by the whole Catholike Church, shall defend the Popes Cathedrall judgements as infallible, and dye in that opinion, they are so farre from dying as *Papias* and *Irene* did, in the peace of the Church; that by the whole catholike Church they are declared, and decreed to dye out of the peace and communion of the whole catholike Church.

*3 Statuimus, nulli licere quicquam contrarium his conscribere, vel proferre. Vig. Const. in fine y Beil. lib. 4. de Pör. ca. 3. et Grez. def. ca. 2. lib. 1. de Pont. pa. 652. et alij.*



*a* Cyprianus ita dixit, quid ei videretur, ut in pace unitatis esse voluerit, etiam cum eis qui de hac re diversa sentirent. Aug. lib. 2. de baptis. ca. 1. in Lib. 1. de baptis. ca. 18.

*b* charitate praesenti quadam (veritatem) venialiter non habentur. Aug. ibid.

*c* Nemo potest subesse Christo, & communicare cum Ecclesia, qui non subest Pontifici Rom. Bell. lib. de Eccl. milit. ca. 5. Schisma est quando unum membrum non vult esse sub illo capite, quare tollit unitatem essentialem atq. Ecclesiam ipsam. Schismaticus igitur non est de Ecclesia. Ibid. & familia habent alij.

*d* Natalis beati Papie. Martyr. Rom. Feb. 22.

*e* Passio Irene Episcopi & Martyris. Mart. in martij. 24. & Menol. Grac. in Aug. 23.

11. A third dissimilitude ariseth from the persons who erre. The former, for all their error, held fast the unity with the Church, even with those who contradicted and condemned their errors; and we doubt not but that was verified of very many of them, which *Austen* affirmeth of *Cyprian*, that they kept this unitie of the Church, humiliter, fideliter, fortiter, ad martyrij usque coronam; kept it with humility, with fidelitie, with constancy, even to the crowne of martyrdom. By reason of which their charity they were not onely fast linked, and, as I may say, glued to the communion of the Church, both in their life, and death, but all their other errors, as *Austen* saith, became veniall unto them: for charity covereth a multitude of sinnes. The latter are so unlike to these, that with their error, and even by it, they have made an eternall breach, and separation of themselves from the Catholike Church; even from all who consent unto, or approve this fift generall Councell: for having by their Laterane decree created, and set up in the Romane Capitoll, this pontificall supremacy, and infallibilitie, they now account all but Schismatickes who consent not with them; they will have no peace, no communion with any, who will not adore this Romish Calfe of the supreme & infallible authoritie of their vice-god. So the former, notwithstanding their error, died in the peace of that Church, to which, by most ardent affection they were conjoynd: The latter dying in this their error, whereby they cut off, and quite dis-joyne themselves from the union of all, who approve the decree of the fift Councell, (and those are the whole catholike Church of all ages) though they dye in the very armes, and bosome of the Queene of Babylon, cannot chuse but die out of the blessed peace, and holy communion of the whole catholike Church, which they have wilfully, insolently, and most disdainfully rejected.

12. The fourth and last difference which I now observe, ariseth from the judgement of the Church concerning them both. The former, she is so farre from once thinking to have dyed in heresie, or heretikes, that shee most gladly testifieth her selfe not onely to hold them in her communion, but to esteeme and honour them as glorious Saints of the Church. *Papian* the author of that opinion, a Saint, *Irene*, *Iustine*, and *Cyprian*, both Saints, and Martyrs. On the parties which hold the latter error, she hath passed a contrary doome; for by decreeing the Cathedral sentence of *Vigilius* to be hereticall, and accursing all who defend it; she hath clearly judged and declared all who defend the Popes infallibilitie in defining causes of faith, to bee heretikes, & dying so, to die heretikes, yea, convicted heretikes, anathematized by the judgement of the catholike Church, and so pronounced to die out of the peace and communion of the catholike Church.

13. I have stayed the longer in dissolving this doubt, partly for that it is very obvious in this cause; and yet (as to me it seemed)

med not very easie; but specially that hereby I might open another error in the Constitution of *Vigilius*, who from the example of those Millenarie Fathers (one of which, to wit *Nepos*, he expressly mentioneth)<sup>f</sup> would conclude, *That none at all though dying in heresie, may after their death be condemned*, seeing *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, though he condemned the bookes and error of *Nepos*, yet *Nepos* himselfe hee did not injure, nor condemne, *propter hoc maxime, quia jam defunctus fuerat, for this reason especially, because Nepos was dead.* But by that which now at large I have declared, it appeareth, that *Vigilius* was twice mistaken in this matter, for neither did *Nepos* die in a formall heresie, but in an error onely at that time, to which he did not pertinaciously adhere; though *Prateolus* <sup>g</sup>, and after him, the Cardinall, <sup>h</sup> upon what reason I know not, but sure none that is good, reckons *Nepos* with *Tertullian*, as one excluded from the ranke and order of catholikes: neither did *Dionysius* or the Church, for that reason at all which *Vigilius* fancieth; much lesse for that specially, forbear to condemne *Nepos*, because he was dead: (for then they would not have condemned *Valentinus*, *Basilides*, *Cerinthus*, who also were dead <sup>i</sup>, when the Church condemned them,) but because they judged *Nepos* as well as *Irene*, *Iustine*, and the rest, to have dyed, though in an error, yet in the unity, peace, and communion of the Church. And this the words of *Dionysius* <sup>k</sup>, not rightly alleaged by *Vigilius*, and no better translated by *Christopherson* doe import. For *Dionysius* said not, that hee therefore revered *Nepos*, *quia jam defunctus fuerat*, as the one <sup>l</sup>, nor *quia ex hac vita migravit*, as the other <sup>m</sup> readerth them, that is, because he was dead, (for upon that reason the holy Bishops should have revered also *Simon Magnus*, *Cerinthus*, and other heretickes, who were then dead) but because <sup>n</sup> *secundum rationem* which *Musculus* very rightly translateth thus; *I much reverence him as one, qui jam ad quietem processit, who is gone before mee unto rest*: that is, because hee so dyed, that his death was a passage to rest; even to that rest of which the scripture <sup>a</sup> saith, using the same words, *they rest from their labour*: to that rest unto which himselfe hoped to follow *Nepos*: for that *Nepos* is gone before to this rest; therefore did *Dionysius* reverence him. So both the assertion of *Vigilius* which from *Dionysius* he would prove, is untrue, that none who are dead may be condemned, and yet the saying of *Dionysius* is true, that such as goe to rest, or dye in the peace of the Church, ought not to be condemned.

14. After this which the Cardinall hath said in generall concerning such as dye in the peace of the Church, hee addeth one thing in particular concerning *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, by way of application of that generall position unto him, saying ° that *Vigilius* was therefore very slacke to condemne him, because hee would not condemne those *quos scisset in catholica communione defunctos*,

<sup>f</sup> *Vig. Const. loc. cit. nu. 178.*

<sup>g</sup> *Prateolum Nepotem recenset inter hereticos, tum in Indice, tum in libro ipso, in suo Elench. verbo Nepos. Et ait eum fuisse authorē Epicuræ illius opinionis, in verbo Chikasse.*

<sup>h</sup> *Mittimus Tertullianum & Nepotem extra classem hereticorum vagantes. Bar. Not. in Mart. Febr. 22.*

<sup>i</sup> *Iustin. in Edicto § Quod autem.*

<sup>k</sup> *Apud Euseb. lib. 7. Eccl. hist. ca. 19.*

<sup>l</sup> *Vigilius.*  
<sup>n</sup> *Christopher. in sua translatione.*

<sup>a</sup> *Apoc. 14. 13.*

o *Bar. an. 553. nu. 491.*

*functus, whom he knew to have died in the catholike communion of the Church.* So the cardinall tells us that *Vigilius* knew, and therefore that it is not onely true, but certaine, that *Theodorus* dyed in the catholike communion.

15. What thinke you doth the cardinall gaine by pleading thus for *Theodorus* a condemned heretike? Truly for his paines herein the holy Councell payes him soundly: for first in plaine termes it call him a liar, and a slanderer, yea a slanderer of the whole Church, and if this be not enough, it denounceth an *Anathema* unto him for so saying: Cursed bee hee that curseth not *Theodorus*; how much more cursed then is he, who acquits *Theodorus* from that curse, who makes *Theodorus* blessed? for blessed are all they that dye in the peace and holy communion of the Church, and that *Theodorus* so dyed the Cardinall for a certainty doth assure us; for *Vigilius* knew that he so dyed.

16. But what Church I pray you is that in the communion whereof the Cardinall assures us *Theodorus* to have dyed? you may bee sure it is their Romane: for in the Cardinalls idiome thats not onely *ut* *ἐκ τῆς* the Church, but its the one and onely Church. In the communion then of their Romane church, even in the communion with the Cardinall himselve dyed *Theodorus*. Now its certaine, he died not in the communion of the Church, which was in the fift generall Councell, for they utterly disclaim him, accurse him, and call them lyars, and slanderers, that say hee dyed in their communion. Againe, its certaine that the Church of that fift Councell, was of the same communion with the whole Catholike and Apostolike Church, themselves professing to hold the same faith, and communion with all former holy generall Councells, and Catholikes, and all succeeding catholikes by approving it, professing the same faith and communion with it. Seeing then *Theodorus* dyed not in the communion of this Church, which is the true and truly catholike Church, and yet dyed as the Cardinall assures you in the communion of their Romane church, it doth clearly and certainly hence ensue, that their Romane church is neither the true catholike, neither hath full communion with the true catholike Church.

17. Lastly, seeing *Theodorus* as the Cardinall tells us, died in the peace, and communion of their Church, and *Theodorus* was most certainly an heretike, condemned by the catholike Church, declared by the same Church to bee accursed, that is, separated from God; nay to be a very Devill, as the holy Councell proclaimed him; Their Romane church must needs bee at peace, and of the same communion with condemned heretikes, with *Arius*, *Nestorius*, *Eutiches*, *Ennomius*, (none of them all can bee worse then as *Theodorus* was, condemned heretikes, by the judgement of the whole Church;) of the same communion with those who are separated from God; yea it must needs be at peace, and league with the Devills communicants. Since this is the peace,  
this

p Hoc symbolum  
Satanas composuit,  
Conc. 5. ita ait de  
symbolo Theodori.  
Collat. 4. pa. 537. a.



this the communion of their church (if *Theodorus* dyed, as the Cardinall assureth us he did, in the peace and communion of it) let them for ever keep to themselves, let them alone enjoy, both alive and dead, this peace, this communion, of their Church. But let dis-union, and immortall warres, be for ever betwixt us, and it; betwixt the society with God, and all communion with it.

— Nullus amor populis, nec fœdera sunt;  
Littora littoribus contraria, fluctibus undas,  
Imprecor; arma armis, pugnent cineresque, nepotesque,  
Et nati natorum, & qui nascentur ab ipsis.

And let this suffice, it to be opposed against the second reason of *Vigilius*, who therefore decreed that *Theodorus* ought not to be condemned, because, as he thought, nay knew, as *Baronius* saith, that *Theodorus* dyed in the peace & communion of the Church.

## CHAP. VIII.

That the third and last reason of *Vigilius* touching the first chapter, why *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia ought not to be condemned, because he was not condemned by former Fathers, and Councils, is erroneous and untrue.

I.



He third and last reason of Pope *Vigilius* in defence of the first Chapter, is drawne from the authority of the ancient Fathers and Councils; by none of which, as he pretendeth, *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia was condemned, and therefore ought not now by himselfe, or any other to be condemned. And

*Vigilius* was so exceeding carefull to enforme both himselfe, and all others of the certainty, and truth herein, that hee saith, wee added, *solicitudinis nostra animum*, the carefull solicitude of our thoughts, and diligentissima investigatione quarere curamus: Wee have taken most diligent care to finde out, whether any thing was decreed, ordered, or disposed by the Fathers, de persona, vel nomine, either concerning the person, or the name of *Theodorus*: and againe, *Omnibus diligenter inspectis*; We have diligently viewed all things belonging to this matter. Now after all this carefull, solicitous, diligent, yea most diligent inspection, *Vigilius* saith, that, neither in the Council of Ephesus<sup>c</sup>, nor of Chalcedon<sup>d</sup>, nor in Cyril<sup>e</sup>, nor in Proclus<sup>f</sup>, nor in other Fathers, could hee finde that *Theodorus* was ever condemned.

2. Truly *Vigilius* had exceeding dimme eyes in this cause: or to speake more truly, *Nestorianisme* had so blinded, and put out his eye-sight, that he could discern almost nothing; though it were never so cleare, and obvious, unlesse it favoured the condemned heresie of *Nestorius*. Can you see neither the person,

a *Vig. Const. nu.*  
173.

b *ibid. nu.* 179.

c *Ipsam Synodum Ephesinam sollicite recensentes, nihil de Theodori persona, referre cõperimus.*  
*ibid. nu.* 173.

d *Sed neq; in sancto Chalcedonensi concilio aliquid de Theodori nomine invenimus statuit.*  
*ibid. nu.* 175.

e *Ex quo claret beatum Cyrillum, non habuisse nomen ejus (Theodori) monumentis Synodalibus propter regulam quæ de mortuis servanda est, contineri.*  
*ibid. nu.* 173.

f *Quando scripti oportere aut Theodorum aut alios qui pridem defuncti sunt anathemati subdi oportere. ibid. ex Proclo. nu.* 174.

no

nor the name of *Theodorus* condemned by the Fathers? not by *Cyrril*? not by *Proclus*? not by the Councells of *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*? not by others? Suffer me I pray you, to helpe the Popes sight with some better spectacles. Of *Cyrril* and *Proclus*, the fift Councell, after a farre better view, and inspection, even in the Synodall decree, doe thus witnesse. They shew their meaning concerniug *Theodorus*, *quod oportet eum anathematizari*, that he ought to be accursed, as we have demonstrated before, out of those things, which *Cyrril*, and *Proclus* have written, ad condemnationem *Theodori*, for the condemning of *Theodorus*, and his impiety. In another place,<sup>h</sup> of them both they write againe in this manner, Let them who pretend the names of *Cyrril*, and *Proclus*, say if *Theodorus* be not by them numbred with the Jewes, Pagans, Sodomites and heretikes; particularly of *Cyrril*, they say<sup>i</sup>, *Cyrril* seeing that diuers continued to defend the blasphemies of *Theodorus*, was forced to write bookes against him and his impieties, & post mortem ejusdem *Theodori*, ostendere eum & hereticum, & impium, & super *Paganos*, & super *Iudaos* blasphemum. And after the death of the same *Theodorus*, to shew him to have beene an heretike, and more blasphemous then either the Jewes or Pagans. This the Councell saw in the writings of *Cyrril*, and *Proclus*, and upon their sight and knowledge testified the same.

3. The words of *Cyrril*, and *Proclus* doe clearly witnesse the same. *Cyrril* speaking<sup>k</sup> of *Theodorus*, calls him one, whose tongue speakes iniquity against God; one whose horne is exalted against God: one who insulteth<sup>l</sup> over Christ, who lesseneth the crimes of the Jewes, who pulleth him downe, ad infamiam, to infamie and disgrace. *Proclus* also speaking<sup>m</sup> not only of the doctrine, but of the person of *Theodorus*, whom he setteth in the same ranke with *Arius*, *Eunomius*, *Macedonius*, and other heretikes, he calleth him as bee doth the rest, turbulentos, & cernosos fallacia rivos, filty and mirie rivers of deceit; adding, that the new blasphemie (which was taught by *Theodorus* and *Nestorius*) doth farre exceed, the blasphemie of the Jewes. Thus *Proclus*. Where thinke you was the Popes eyes, when hee could not, or would not see any of all this? Or if yet wee doubt of *Cyrril*s minde herein, *Baronius*<sup>n</sup> himselfe could not chuse, but observe this out of him, you see that *Cyrril* doth una, eademque lance, *Theodorum* expendere cum *Nestorio*, put him in the same scale, and weigh him altogether alike, as he doth *Nestorius*. So the Cardinall: checking the Popes sight, that would not see him to be condemned by *Cyrril*, whom *Cyrril* esteemed every whit as wicked an heretike as *Nestorius*.

4. But this whole matter, and the unexcusable error of *Vigilius*, will be most evident, by considering the judgment of the *Ephesine* Councell touching *Theodorus*, and what ensued upon, or after it. That *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, who dyed about some foure<sup>o</sup> yeares before, was condemned in the holy Councell at *Ephesus*, *Cyrril* who was President in that Councell doth declare,

g Conc. 5. coll. 8. pa. 585. b.

h Coll. 9. pa. 551. b.

i Ibid. pa. 551. a.

k *Cyrrilli verba citantur in Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 551. a.*  
l *Quousq; insultat patienti Christo.*  
ibid.  
m *Epist. Procli ad Armenios, de fide, extat to. 3. Bib. 5. & citantur verba ejus in Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 551. & 542. b. Proclus de Theodoro & ejus impietate ita dicit, &c.*

n *Bar. an. 435. nu. 11.*

o *Theodorus obiit nu. 427. Bar. nu. 27. Conc. Ephes. habitum nu. 432. Bar. & Rin.*

as the fift Councell witnesseth. Cyrill (say<sup>r</sup> they in the Synodall decree) writ unto John, touching Theodorus, *utpote una cum Nestorio anathematizato*; as being anathematized together with Nestorius, in the Ephesine Synod: and this they shew out of the words of Cyrill, which are <sup>r</sup> worthy of most diligent consideration. Peltanus, and after him <sup>r</sup> Binus, have very unfitly translated Cyrills words, but in the Greeke, as also consonantly thereunto they are set downe in the fift<sup>r</sup> Councell, thus; *Processit adversus omnes, qui eadem sapiunt, vel sapuerunt aliquando*; to witte, *omnes qui eadem sapiunt, vel sapuerunt aliquando*: id quod absolute, nos & vestra sanctitas dixit, *Anathematizamus illos, qui dicunt duos filios*: That sentence of Anathema, which we (to wit, the holy Ephesine Councell) and your Holinesse pronounced absolutely, (without naming any person) saying, we accuse those who say there are two Sonnes, or two Christs: that sentence proceeded against all who doe thinke so, or who have thought so. Thus Cyrill, and that also in one of those his Synodall Epistles, which the holy Councell of Chalcedon, in their very definition of faith, hath approved: so that this is now not onely the judgement of Cyrill, but of the whole Councell at Chalcedon. The same is repeated againe by Cyrill, and more conspicuously in his Epistle <sup>r</sup> to Anastasius, Alexander, and the rest, which also hath equall authoritie by the Councell of Chalcedon. *Sancta Synodus Ephesi*, saith Cyrill, *The holy Ephesine Synod*, having pronounced a just sentence of condemnation against Nestorius, hath by the like sentence condemned the impiety of others, *qui vel postea futuri sunt, vel jam fuerunt eadem illi sapientes*; who either shall hereafter, or heretofore have thought the same; *equalem condemnationem eis imponens*; imposing the same condemnation upon them also: for it is fit, that when one is condemned for such vaine speeches, *non contra unum tantum venire*, that the sentence should not come against him alone, but against the whole heresie, and sect. Thus S. Cyrill setting this downe for a golden rule to be observed, in all Synodall sentences, and judgements of faith; and being so usefull, the fift Synod doth often<sup>r</sup> insist upon it.

5. Seeing then Theodorus did not onely teach, write, and speake the same with Nestorius, but was indeed the Archheretike, and author of this heresie, Nestorius being but his<sup>a</sup> disciple, or the trunke to found out or blaze abroad that hereticall doctrine, which Theodorus had breathed into him; it is evident by this golden rule of Cyrill, that though Theodorus was dead before the Synod at Ephesus, yet the anathema and condemnation denounced by the Synod, no lesse pertaineth to him, than to Nestorius, though the one was named, and not the other. And this the fift Councell out of those very words of Cyrill, doth collect, and warrant others to collect the same. The writings, say they, of<sup>b</sup> Theodorus being in all things consonant to the vaniloquie of Nestorius, are together with his, deservedly rejected by the Councell of Ephesus, *utpote anathemate quod adversus Nestorium factum*

p Conc. 5. Coll. 8. pa. 585. a.

q In Epist. ad Iob. Antioch. & Synod. cum eo.

r In Asia Conc. Ephes. tom. 5. ca. 9. f Conc. 5. Coll. 8. pa. 585. a.

t Pel. & Bin. ita vertunt, *Ita & nobis & vestra sanctitati absolute dicere liceat, Anathematizamus, &c.*

u Epistolas Cyrilli Synodicas ad Nestorium et alios per Orientem acceptissimas habet. Sic de se ait Conc. Chalced. 5. pa. 96.

x Quae extat in Act. Conc. Ephes. tom. 2. Append. 1. ca. 6. et citantur etiam haec Cyrilli verba in Conc. 5. Coll. 8. pa. 585. a.

y Coll. 5. pa. 543. b. et pa. 548. a. et in sententia Synodali Coll. 8. pa. 585. a.

a Theodorus doctor Nestorij. Justin. in Epist. ad Conc. 5. Coll. 1. pa. 519. b. et idem ait Conc. 5. in sententia Synodali Coll. 8. pa. 585. b. et Nestorius Theodori verba loquutus est. Coll. 5. pa. 530. a. et. Nec enim Theodorus Nestorij fuit discipulus, sed iste illius ibid.

b Coll. 5. pa. 549. b.



est procedente etiam adversus eos, qui ante illum similia illi sapuerunt: the Anathema which was pronounced against Nestorius, proceeding also against those, who before Nestorius thought the same which he did.

c Pel. 2. epist. 7. 5  
In his.

d Symbolum quod  
Charisius Presbyter  
illis prodidit, &c.  
Vig. Const. loc. cit.  
n. 173.  
e Pelag. loc. cit.

6. This same judgement of the Ephesine Councell, in condemning Theodorus, is yet another way declared, and testified expressly by Pope Pelagius, Theodorum cum mortuum sancta Synodus Ephesina damnavit; the holy Ephesine Councell condemned Theodorus being dead: which so cleare a testimony, though alone, were enough to manifest the foule error of Vigilinus in this point. But Pelagius sets downe a prooffe also therof, which openeth another error of Vigilinus. He to excuse Theodorus, would perswade that <sup>d</sup> Theodorus was not the composer of that impious, and diabolically creed, before mentioned. Heare now the words, and and prooffe of Pelagius, taken from that creed: The Ephesine Synod, saith <sup>e</sup> he, condemned Theodorus, nam cum ab ejus discipulis dictatum ab eo Symbolum, for when that creed, dictated and composed by Theodorus, was brought forth before the Ephesine Synod, cum auctore damnatum est; both it, and the author of it was condemned presently by the same holy Fathers. So Pelagius: testifying against Vigilinus, both Theodorus to bee the author of that creed; and both him, and it, to have beene condemned by the Ephesine Councell.

f Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa.  
575. b.

g Coll. 5. pa. 575. b.

h Coll. 4. pa. 537. a.

i Just. Edict. 5 Tuli.

7. What Pelagius saith was formerly delivered by the whole fift Councell, who thus say, <sup>f</sup> Theodorus; besides other innumerable blasphemies, ausus est & impium exponere symbolum, was so audacious as to set out that impious creed: & again, hoc impium Theodori Symbolum, this impious creed of Theodorus was anathematized, together with the writer of it, in the first Ephesine Councell: and againe, when this creed was repeated, which is by them called, Impium Theodori Symbolum, the impious creed of Theodorus; the holy Synod <sup>h</sup> cryed out, anathema to him that composed it; (and that was Theodorus as themselves witness;) the holy Ephesine Councell accursed this creed, una cum auctore ejus, together with the author of it. Thus testified the whole Councell. Before this fift Councell, Iustinian, in his most religious Edict, witnesseth the same. Theodorus (saith <sup>i</sup> hee) who exceeds in impiety, Pagans, Jewes, and all heretikes, did not onely contemne the Nicene Creed, sed aliud symbolum exposuit, but he hath expounded another creed, full of all impiety: and this impious creed of Theodorus being produced in the first Ephesine Synod, cum ejus expositore, condemnatum est; was condemned, together with the author or composer of it, by that holy Councell. So the Emperour.

k Cyrilli verba ex  
ep. ad Procl. conc.  
sur. Conc. 5. Coll. 5.  
pa. 550, 551.

8. Before all these, this is testified, and fully explained by S. Cyrill, who <sup>k</sup> was the chiefe Bishop in the Ephesine Synod: This creed, saith he, composed by Theodorus, as they, who brought it, said, or witnessed, was rejected by the holy Councell; and those who thought as that creed taught, being condemned (in which generall sentence Theodorus himselfe was especially included) nullam

virum mentionem fecit dispensatione, nec ipsum nominatim anathemati subiectus propter dispensationem; the Council by a dispensation, made no particular mention of Theodorus, but forbore by name to denounce an anathema against him, by a kinde of connivence, or indulgence: lest some, who held him in great account, should separate themselves from the Church. So Cyrill. Whence two things are evident; the one that Theodorus, though dead before, was condemned in generall termes by the Ephesine Council: The other, that they might in particular also have condemned him, as they did Nestorius, but they forbore that particular naming of him, onely by a dispensation, toleration, or connivence at his name: because Theodorus was then held by many in great account, his impieties, and blasphemies being not as yet so fully discovered to the world: Wherein the Ephesine Council imitated the wisdom and lenitie of the Apostles, who for a time by a dispensation, and connivence, permitted the use of the Ceremoniall Law, that so by insensible degrees the Jewes might be weaned from that, unto which they had beene so long accustomed: which examples of the Apostles, the first Council, even in their Synodall sentence, apply to this very cause of Theodorus: the Church and Ephesine Council, for a time, spared by name to condemne him, even then, when by their generall sentence hee was as truly condemned, as the Judaicall ceremonies were dead, (though then not deadly) to the end that the estimation which some (but very unjustly) had of him, might rather *dissolve*, than *dissolve*, rather by little and little be untwined, and worne out, than by a peremptory anathema, be at once, and as it were with one violent blow, obliterated out of the hearts of such as admired him, which they saw could hardly be effected.

9. But as the Apostles, when afterwards the Gospell had been long published, and sufficient time allowed, to forget, and bury the ceremonies, then did utterly condemne all that used the same, saying, *If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing*: Even so did the Church in this cause of Theodorus. She expected that her generall sentence should have deterred all from that heresie, specially seeing the Emperours, Theodosius, and Valentinian, had strengthened that Synodall judgement, by a severe Imperiall Edict, set forth some foure yeares after the Ephesine Synod, forbidding the bookes of Nestorius, either to bee read, or retained: But it fell out farre otherwise, for when the Nestorians could no longer shrowd themselves under the name, nor countenance their heresie by the bookes and writings of Nestorius, they found this new device, to commend their doctrine, under the name, dignity, and authority of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, whose doctrine was the very same with that of Nestorius, he having sucked all his hereticall poyson from Theodorus, and this they thought they might safely doe, Theodorus being not by name condemned, either in the Synodall judgement, or by the

Imperiall

1 Et talem dispensationem in divina scriptura est invenire. Paulus ad hoc Timothy. motum. Chrysostomus. dist. 6. Conc. 5. coll. 8. pa. 185. b. et coll. 5. pa. 351. b.

m Gal 5.1.

n L. 66. de heret.

cod. Theod.

o Conc. 186. b. b. i.

an. 431. Ruffus et d.

tinus coll. ut an.

aff. liquet. Tem.

ca. 1. Ad idem vera

editum Theodorus.

1 s. coll. id est. an. 431.

p. Can. 18. q. 1. hinc

que Nestorius sent.

dist. 6. alio utrum ad

introducatur modo.

qua Theodorus sunt

advocatae. Cyrill.

ca. 1. verba citatur

in Conc. 5. coll. 5.

pa. 550. 4. et 551.

docet Liber. ca. 10.

Imperiall Edi&t. To which purpose they, and particularly *Ibas*, spread abroad the bookes of *Theodorus* in every countrey, and corner, translating them, as *Liberatus* sheweth, into the *Syrian*, *Armenian*, and *Persian* languages; by which meanes they deceived, and seduced many, pretending *Theodorus*' writings to bee consonant to the ancient fathers. The Catholikes seeing how little effect their connivence at *Theodorus*' name had taken; and that the heretikes abused their lenitie in forbearing him, to strengthen their heresie, saw that now it was time, no longer to dispense or winke at *Theodorus*; and therefore the time of that dispensation being expired, they began now in plaine termes, and by name, to condemne both his person, and his writings, as before they had in a generalitie performed them both in the Council of *Ephesus*; and this was done by severall Bishops, in severall Countries, and by many severall wayes.

10. The first sentence wherein *Theodorus* was particularly, and by name condemned, was in a Council at *Armenia*, where the credit of *Theodorus* had done most hurt. The chiefe Bishops in that Synod, were *Acatius* Bishop of *Melitin* in *Armenia*, a very learned, & holy mā, who had bin one of the chiefe also in the holy *Ephesine* Council; and *Rambulas*, or *Rabulas* Bishop of *Edeffa*, (whose name it seemes the *Nestorians* for very spite against him, turned into *Rabala*, that so they might with more facility revile his person) a man of such piety and high esteeme in the Church, that *Cyrril* calls him *columnam, & fundamentum veritatis*; the very pillar and foundation of the truth; and *Benignus* testifieth, that he was a faire and resplendent lampe in the Church. These two stirred up the Bishops of *Armenia* to reject the writings of *Theodorus*, *tantum haretici*, as one who was an heretike; yea, the author of the *Nestorian* heresie; and themselves were present in that noble Council of *Armenia*, wherein they not onely condemned *Theodorus* as an impious person; an oppugner of *Christ*, and the childe of the *Devill*; as by the contents of the acts of that Synod doth appeare; but further also, they writ their Synodal letters, both to *Proclus*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, & to *Cyrril* Bishop of *Alexandria*, *quatenus fiat unitas vestra contra Theodorum, & sacrilega dogmata ejus*; that they also would joyne with them; and their Synod, in condemning by name, both the person and sacrilegious writings of *Theodorus*; giving this as a reason thereof, because they exhorted them but to doe in plaine, and expresse manner, the same thing which was done by them before, but in a generalitie: We write unto you, per *agratiam* antea condemnatum sine nomine, *Theodorum nominatim condemnari*; that *Theodorus* may now by name, bee condemned by you, who hath already, though without expressing his name, been condemned by you. And what they exhorted *Proclus* and *Cyrril* to doe, that *Rambulas* performed, not onely in the *Armenian* Council, but in his owne Church at *Edeffa*; for as *Ibas* in his impious

*p Ibas quedam ex impijs Theodori Capitulis in Syrorum linguam tranſtulit, et ubique tranſmiſit. Con. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 362. b.*

*q Ca. 10.*

*r Theodori ſcripta admirantes, et dicentes cum reſta (apuliſſa et conſonantia ſanctis patribus, Athanaſio, &c. Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 550. a.*

*s Quoniam nos ſuſceperant diſſa illorum, et tempus, quod diſpenſationis indiſcretis, praeſentis, ſanctiſſimis (patres) quoniam ſuperius diſſa ſunt, poſt mortem ejus ad verſus eum, et ejus ſcripta. Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 551. b.*

*t Vt liquet ex ſubſcriptionibus, in quibus ſepe Acatius. To. 2. Ali. Conc. Eph. ca. 3.*

*u Rambulas vocatur in Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 549. a. et apud Gratian. Cauſ. 24. a. 2. ca. 6. ex Emeſ. Greg. 13.*

*x Sic a Liberato (homine Neſtoriano vocatur. ca. 10. et Ibas narrat Theodorum in juſſe a Rabula damnatum. Bar. an. 448. nu. 72.*

*y Cyrrilli Epiſt. ad Rabulam in Conc. 3. Coll. 5. pa. 543. b.*

*z Rambulas ſanctae memoriae Epiſcopus, qui in ſacerdotibus exſplenduit. Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 543. b.*

*a Liber. ca. 40.*

*b Phil. ad ſ. Concilium in Armenia celebratum. Actus illius concilii. Bar. an. 435. nu. 4.*

*c Liber. tranſtulit ſub nomine Epiſcopi Armeniae Procli, nec in Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 549.*



Epistle<sup>d</sup> saith, *Ausus est Theodorum clare anathematizare, hee was bold by name, and expressly, to anathematize Theodorus in his owne Church, and; both Benignus and Liberatus witnesse the same.*

II. What Proclus did upon receipt of those letters sent from the Armenian Councell unto him, is not to be learned out of Liberatus report of this matter, for he in the narration of this passage, is not onely untrite, and partiall, but very hereticall also, justly herein taxed by Baronius<sup>e</sup>, and Binus<sup>h</sup>, as borrowing his narration from some Nestorians; which the Reader will easily observe: but the truth herein must be taken out of Cyrill, and the fifth Councell. Proclus, saith Cyrill<sup>i</sup>, *sent a tome or writing to them of Armenia full of sound doctrine*, and hee adjoyned thereunto certaine chapters, *collecta à Theodori codicibus*, gathered out of the bookes of Theodorus, consonant to the doctrine of Nestorius, exhorting them, *etiam illa anathematizare, to accurse even those doctrines of Theodorus also*. The fifth Councell explains this more fully, Proclus say they<sup>k</sup>, *writeth thus against Theodorus and his impious doctrine*. And then they cite, first those words of Proclus before mentioned, wherein he sets Theodorus in the same ranke with Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius<sup>l</sup>, and other like heretikes, calling them all puddles of errors and deceit. And after this, those other words of Proclus, written to Iohn Bishop of Antioch, wherein he calleth the doctrines of Theodorus; or those chapters which were collected out of his bookes, *vaniloquie, monstroloquie, Iudaicall impietie: ad destructionem legentium evomita: doctrines vomited out by him, to the destruction of the readers and hearers: exhorting others, to reject, to abhorre, to tread under foot, and to accurse all those chapters of Theodorus: utpote diabolica infania confutata, & inventiones: as being the positions and inventions of devilish madnesse*. From which words of Proclus, uttered both against the person, and doctrine of Theodorus; the Councell concludeth very justly, that Proclus (not onely in particular condemned Theodorus as the Armenian Councell exhorted him) but condemned him as a Jew, Pagan, and Heretike: And this was done by Proclus in the year when Valentinian was the 4, and Theodosius the 15. time Consul, as the date of his letter or Tome to the Armenians doth declare, which declares also, that the Armenian Councell was held the same year<sup>n</sup>: for it followed the spreading abroad of the bookes of Theodorus; and that was not done till the Nestorians were by the Imperiall Edict forbidden to reade the bookes of Nestorius: Now the Imperiall Edict beares date, in the same consulship<sup>o</sup>, which shewes evidently, that as soone as ever the Nestorians began to revive the honour, and name of Theodorus (being onely in a generality before condemned) the catholikes forthwith opposed themselves, and by name condemned him. And which is specially to be observed, Proclus did this against Theodorus, although the Easterne Bishops intrated him<sup>p</sup> *plurimis deprecationibus, ut ne anathematizaretur*

H

Theodorus,

<sup>d</sup> Quæ extat in Conc. Chal. A. 10. c. Conc. 5. coll. 5. p. 549. a. f. Liber. ca. 10.

<sup>g</sup> Liberatus causæ legendus, utpote qui ab aliquo Nestoriano eam videtur mutuatus historiam. Bar. an. 435. nu. 9. <sup>h</sup> Historiam ca. 10. incautè nimis ab al quo Nestoriano magna ex parte mutuatus videtur. Bin. de Liberato. Notis ad Liber. i. Cyrilli verba citantur in Conc. 5. coll. 5. p. 543. b. <sup>k</sup> Coll. 5. p. 551. a. <sup>l</sup> In Epist. Procli quæ extat in Bibl. S. p. 103. corrupte legitur Manichei.

<sup>m</sup> Corruptè legitur in editione illa epist. quæ extat 10. 3. B. S. pat. Theodosius. pro 15. ut ex falsis liquet in Conc. Armenia habitum an. 435. Bar. anno illo. nu. 4. is est Coss. Theodosij 15. et Valent. 4. <sup>o</sup> Coss. Theodosij 15. quæ est an. 435. juxta Bar. illo an. nu. 1.

<sup>p</sup> Conc. 5. coll. 5. p. 551. a.

*Theodorus, nec impia ejus conscripta*, did with most earnest prayers sollicite him, not to condemne the person, or doctrine of *Theodorus*: but, the truth of God which was oppugned by *Theodorus*, and the sentence of the Councell which had condemned *Theodorus*, did more prevaile then all their supplication with that holy Bishop.

12. Saint *Cyrill* did the like as *Proclus* herein, hee seeing the connivence<sup>a</sup>, and dispensation of the Councell, not to take the intended effect, but that the Nestorians proceeded rather from worfe to worfe, boasting of *Theodorus* writings, that they were consonant to the ancient Fathers, and so farre applauding him, that in some Churches they would cry out, *Crescat fides Theodori, sic credimus sicut Theodorus*, let the faith of *Theodorus* increase, we beleerve as he did: yea even stoning<sup>c</sup> some in the Church who spake against them, *Cyrill* seeing all this, could forbear no longer, *Ego ista non sustinui, sed fiducialiter dixi*, I could not hold my selfe to heare those things, but said with great boldnesse, and confidence, that *Theodorus* was a blasphemous speaker, a blasphemous writer, that he was an<sup>u</sup> heretike, *mentiuntur contra sanctos patres*, I said, that they belyed the holy Fathers, who affirmed *Theodorus* writings, to be consonant to theirs, *nec cessavi increpare ea que scripserunt, nec cessabo: nec habeo creasce, nec cessabo*, to reprove those who write thus: and which demonstrates yet further the zeale of that holy Bishop; he writ<sup>v</sup> the same things concerning *Theodorus*, to the Emperor *Theodosius*, exhorting him<sup>x</sup> to keepe his soule unspotted from his impieties. Thus *Cyrill* by name condemning both the person and writings of *Theodorus*.

13. The religious Emperors *Theodosius* & *Valentinian* moved partly by the grave admonitions of *Cyrill*, and specially by that disturbance which the Nestorians then made, by their defending and magnifying *Theodorus*; besides the former against *Nestorius*, published two other Imperiall Edicts, against *Theodorus*, declaring him by name, to have beene every way as blasphemous an heretike as *Nestorius*; and that the defenders of him, or his writings, should be lyable to the same punishments, as the defenders of *Nestorius*. Those Edicts being so pregnant, to demonstrate the error of *Vigilius*, I have thought it needfull, to expresse some parts or clauses of them.

14. We<sup>a</sup> againe<sup>b</sup> declare that the doctrine *impiorum*, & *pestiferorum*, of those impious and pestiferous persons is abominable unto us: *similiter autem & omnes*, and so are all who follow their error. It is just that they all have one name, and bee all clothed with confusion, lest while they be called Christians they seeme to be honoured by that title; Wherefore we by this our Law doe enact, that whosoever in any part of the world be found, consenting to the most wicked purpose of *Nestorius*, and *Theodorus*, that from hence forward they shall be called Symonians, as *Constantine* decreed, that the followers of *Arius* should be called Porphyrians. Further let none presume either to

have

<sup>q</sup> Quoniam ejusmodi dispensationem *Cyrilli* & *Procli* non susceperunt (*Nestoriani*) è contrario vero permanserunt descendentes blasphemias *Theodori*, videns *Cyrillus* crescentem impietatem coactus est libros conscribere adversus *Theodorum*, & post mortem ejusdem, eum hereticum, & impium, et supra *Paganos* et *Judeos* blasphemum ostendere. Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 551. a. & Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 550. a. <sup>s</sup> Ibid. <sup>r</sup> Ibid. citantur verba *Cyrilli*. ex *Epipli*. ad *Acat*. <sup>u</sup> Coactus est ostendere eum esse hereticum. *ibid.* pa. 551. a. <sup>x</sup> Ibid. pa. 551. a. <sup>y</sup> Sed et ad *Theodosium Imper.* consonantiam scribens. *ibid.* <sup>z</sup> Rogo ut intactas, et inviolatas animas vestras conservetis ab impietatibus *Theodori*. *ibid.*

<sup>a</sup> Extant leges illæ *Theodosij* et *Valentini*. in Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 544. 545. <sup>b</sup> Iterum igitur doctrina *Diadori*, *Theodori* et *Nestorij* abominanda visa sunt. *ibid.*

have, or keepe, or write their sacrilegious bookes, especially not those of *Theodorus*, and *Nestorius*: but all their bookes shall bee diligently sought, and being found, shall be publickly burned. *Neque de cetero inveniatur prædictorum hominum memoria*: neither let there be found any memorie of the foresaid persons: Let none receive such as love that sect, or love their teachers, either in any city, field, suburbs; let them not assemble in any place, either openly, or privily. And if any shall doe contrary to this our sanction, let him be cast into perpetuall banishment, and let all his goods be confiscate. And let your excellency (they sent this to their Lieutenant) publish this our Law through the whole world, in every Province, and in every city. Thus did the Emperours enact, and which is specially also to be remembred, they enacted all this, corroborantes <sup>c Jbid. p. 545. a.</sup> *ea que prædicta decreta sunt Ephesi*, strengthening thereby that which was decreed at *Ephesus*.

15. Whence two things may be observed, the one, that *Theodorus* was not onely accounted, and by name, condemned for an heretike, as by other catholiks, so by the Emperours also, but that this particular condemning was consonant to the decree of the *Ephesine* Synode, this being nothing else but an explanation of that, which they in generall termes had set down, and a corroboration of the same: The other, that seeing this Imperiall decree, hath stood ever since the enacting thereof in force, and unrepealed, by vertue of it; had it beene, or were it as yet, I say not rigorously, but duly, and justly put in execution, not any one defender of the three Chapters, no not Pope *Vigilius* himselfe, nor any who defends his *Apostolicall constitution*, (and those are all the members of the present Romane church) not one of them, should either have beene heretofore, or be now tolerated, in any city, suburbs, towne, village, or field; but besides the ecclesiasticall, censures and anathemes, denounced against the, by the Councell and catholike church, they should endure, if no sharper edge of the civill sword, yet, perpetuall banishment out of all Christian Common-wealths, with losse and confiscation of all their goods.

16. After this Imperiall Law was once published, the name and credit of *Theodorus* (whose memory the Emperours had condemned and forbidden) grew into a generall contempt, and hatred, whereof the church of *Mosvestia*, where hee had beene Bishop, gave a memorable example. They for a time esteemed of *Theodorus*, as a catholike Bishop, and for that cause kept his name in their dipticks, or Ecclesiasticall tables; reciting him among the other Orthodox Bishops of that city, in their Eucharisticall commemoration; But now seeing him detected, and condemned, both by catholike Bishops, by Councells, and by the Imperiall Edict for an heretike, they expunged and blotted out the name of *Theodorus*, and in his roome inserted in their dipticks, the name of *Cyrill*, who though hee was not Bishop in



that See, yet had by his pietie and zeale manifested and maintained the faith, & brought both the heresie & person of *Theodorus* into a just detestation, and all this is evident by the Acts of that Synode <sup>d</sup> held at *Mopsuestia*, about this very matter, of wiping out of the name of *Theodorus*.

17. We are now come to the time of the Councell of *Chalcedon*: for, the expunging of *Theodorus* name, and inserting of *Cyrills*, followed as it seemes shortly after the death of *Cyrill*, and he dyed about seven \* yeares before the Councell of *Chalcedon*. That by it *Theodorus* was also condemned, their approving <sup>f</sup> the Councell of *Ephesus*, and the Synodall Epistles of *Cyrill*, (in both which, and in the later, by name <sup>g</sup> *Theodorus* is condemned) doth manifest: and besides this the Emperour *Iustinian* expresly faith <sup>h</sup> of it, that the impious Creed of *Theodorus* being recited in that Councell, both it, *cum expositore ejus*, with the Author and expounder of it, (and that was *Theodorus*) were condemned in the Councell of *Chalcedon*.

18. When many yeares after that holy Councell, some Nestorians began againe, contrary to the Edict of *Theodosius*, and *Valentinian*, to revive the dead, and condemned memory of *Theodorus*, *Sergius* Bishop of *Cyprus* making mention <sup>i</sup>, and commemorating him in the Collect among catholikes; the truth of this matter being examined and found, that same *Sergius* by the command of *Iustinus* the Emperour, was deposed from his Bishopricke, excluded out of the Church, and so continued even to his dying day: and this was done but six yeares before the Emperour of *Iustinian*, as by the date <sup>k</sup> of *Iustinus* his letters doth appear.

19. Now if to all these particular sentences, you adde that which the first Councell <sup>l</sup> witnesseth, that *Theodorus*, post mortem a catholica ecclesia ejectus est, hath beene after his death condemned, and cast out, and that even by the whole Catholike Church, you will easily confesse, that from the time almost of his death, unto the rainge of *Iustinian* there hath beene a continuall, and never interrupted condemnation of him in the Church. But in *Iustinians* time, and perhaps before, though lesse eagerly, the Nestorians began afresh, to renew the memory and doctrine of *Theodorus*, setting now a fairer glosse and varnish on their cause, then ever they had before: for they very gladly apprehending and applauding those (to say the least) inconsiderate speeches of the Popes Legares, & *Maximus* in the Councell of *Chalcedon*, that by his dictation, or Epistle, *Ibas* was declared to be a catholike, hereupon they now boasted, that the holy Councell, by approving that Epistle of *Ibas*, had approved, both the person and doctrine of *Theodorus*, seeing they both are highly extolled, and defended in that Epistle. By this meanes was this cause brought ab inferis the second time, upon the stage, and that also cloaked under the name, and credit of the Councell of *Chalcedon*. And at this le-

cond

d *Acta illa Synodi Mopsuest. extant in Conc. 5. Collat. 5. pa. 553. & seq.*

e *Cyrill. objit an. 444. Conc. Chalced. habitum an. 451. Bar. et. Bin. f Conc. Chalc. Act. 5. in definit. Synodi. g Vt liquet ex Cyrilli Epistola ad Iobannem & iacobum, et ad Acacium, que citantur in Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 549. et 550. h Iustin. Edict. 5. Tali.*

i Vt testantur Act. Conc. 5. Coll. 7. pa. 578. a. et. 582. a.

k *Iustinus scripsit id edictum, Rustico Coss. Conc. 5. Coll. 7. pa. 582. b. fuit in Coss. an. 520. ut testatur Marcell. in Chron. et agnoscit, Bar. in illo an. nu. Iustinianus vero capit imperare an. 527. ut Marcell. et Baron. asserunt. l Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 557. a.*

condemne; all the defenders of the *Three Chapters*, and among them Pope *Vigilius*, as Generall to them all, undertooke the defence of *Theodorus*: and, as if there had never beene any sentence of condemnation, either in generall, or in particular denounced against him, even in his definitive, and *Apostolicall* constitution declareth, That *Theodorus* was not condemned, either by former Councils, or Fathers; and this he declareth after his solicitous, circumspective, and most diligent examination of their writings.

20. What thinke you was become of the Popes eyes at this time, that he could see none of all those condemnations of *Theodorus*, before mentioned? Not the general *anathema* of the Councils at *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*, in which *Theodorus* was involved: not the expresse, and particular *anathema* denounced against him by *Rambulus*, and *Acatius*, with the Councell of *Armenia*: not the condemnation of him, and his writings by Saint *Proclus*, by *S. Cyrill*, by the Church of *Mopsuestia*, by the Edict of the religious Emperours, by the whole Catholike Church. None of all these things were done in a corner; they were all matters of publike notice, and record; obvious to any that did not shut their eyes against the sun-shine of the truth. But, as I said before, and must often say, Nestorianisme, like *Naash* the Ammonite, had put out the Popes right eye, he could see nothing with that eye; all that he saw in this cause, was but a very oblique, and sinister aspect, as doth now, I hope, fully appeare, but will bee yet much more manifest, by that which in the *Constitution* of *Vigilius* we are next to consider.

21. For, as if it were a small matter, not to see *Theodorus* condemned by the former Councils, and Fathers, (though in a man professing so exact and accurate inspection in any cause, such grosse oversights are not veniall) the Pope ventures one step further, for the credit of this condemned heretike. Hee could not finde that *Theodorus* was condemned by the former witnesses: Tush, that is nothing, he findes him acquitted by them all: hee findes by *Cyrill*, by *Proclus*, by the Councils of *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*, yea, by *Iustinians* owne law, that *Theodorus* ought not to be condemned. This was indeed a point worthy the Popes owne finding. But withall I must tell you, that you also shall finde one other thing, that Pope *Vigilius*, having once passed the bounds of truth, for defence of *Theodorus*, cares not now if he wade up to the eares, and drowne himselfe in untruths.

22. Let us then examine the allegations, which, for proove of this, the Pope hath found, and begin we, as the Pope doth, with *Cyrill*. In his<sup>m</sup> Epist. to *Iohn B. of Antioch*, *Vigilius* found an explication, how it was said by *Cyrill*, that by a dispensation the name of *Theodorus* was not condemned; for there *Cyrill* saith, *Sed iuste audiens, they shall justly heare this*, though they will not: ye forget your selves, when you bend your bowes against ashes, that is,

against the dead; for he who is written among them (that is, the dead) *nō superest*; is *hōr*; and let no man blame me for these words, *Grave est enim insultare defunctis, vel si Laici fuerint*; for it is an hard matter, to insult over the dead, yea, though they bee but Laikes; how much more over those, who with their Bishopricks have left their lives. Out of which words *Vigilius* affirmeth *S. Cyrill* to teach it to be an injurious and hard matter, repugnant to the Ecclesiasticall rule, to condemne any that is dead; and then certainly not a Bishop, not *Theodorus*.

n Beate recordationis  
Cyrillum: et beatus  
Cyrillus. Vig.  
loc. cit.

o Conc. s. Coll. 5.  
pa. 549. a.

p Coll. 8. pa. 585. b.

23. For answer hereunto, I doe earnestly intreate the reader to ponder seriously the Popes good dealing herein. That Epistle which *Vigilius* commendeth unto us, under the name of *S. Cyril*, is none of *Cyril*; it is a base and counterfeit writing, forged by some *Nestorians* in the name of *Cyrill*; Witnesse hereof the whole fift generall Councell, who, of purpose, and at large, examined this matter, and refuted this cavill of *Vigilius*, before ever he set forth his *Constitution*; for thus they say of it, *Some loving the perfidiousnesse of Nestorius, which is all one as to say the madnesse of Theodorus, do not refuse to faine some things, and use certaine words, as written in an Epistle by S. Cyril; Nusquam vero talis Epistola scripta est à sancta memoria Cyrillo; but Cyril never writ such an Epistle, neither is it in his bookes. And then reciting the whole Epistle, and all those words which Vigilius alleageth; they adde, Et ista quidem continet conficta Epistola; these are the contents of this counterfeit Epistle: and a little after, That nothing of all, quae in conficta Epistola continentur, which are contained in that counterfeit Epistle, was writ by Cyril, it is declared by that which he writ to Acacius: and yet further, These things are spoken, ad convictionem Epistola, quae à defensoribus Theodori falso composita est; to convince that Epistle to be a forgerie, which is falsely composed by the defenders of Theodorus. The summe of this they repeate in their Synodall sentence, saying, We have found, that the defenders of Theodorus have done the same which heretikes are wont to doe; for they clip away some part of the Fathers words, quadam vero falsa ex semetipsis componentes, & confingentes; and devising, or faining other things of themselves, they seeke by them, as it were, by the testimony of Cyril, to free Theodorus from the Anathema. Thus the Councell: all of them with one voyce proclaiming Pope *Vigilius* for a lewd dealer, who commends, and that even in his *Apostolicall Constitution*, a false and forged writing, for the true Epistle of *S. Cyril*.*

q Conc. Afric. E-  
pist. ad Celest. ca.  
305. rom. 1. conc.  
pa. 645. et seq.

24. It is true, *Vigilius* is not the first Pope, who hath blemished their See, by such false and fraudulent dealing: *Zozimus* and *Bonifacius* were long before this taxed, and that justly, by the *Africane Bishops*, for *disowning the Nicene Canons*. *Vigilius* was too too bold with *Cyrill*, as now you see. But if you descend to Pope *Nicholas*, or to *Gregory* the seventh, and their successors, they were so shamelesse and audacious in this kinde, that they  
scacre



scarce writ any decrees of importance, but they stuffed them with such Fathers: Even the basest, and most abject fictions, which were voyd, not onely of truth, but of braine, were fittest for the Popes, and their Pontificall determinations, and were they never so base, and bastardly, yet the Popes, like kind Godfathers, could, when they listed, christen them with the names of S. Cyrill, Cyprian, or the like, and then they must be called, or esteemed for no others, than holy and reverend Fathers.

25. Proclus followeth: In whose writings *Vigilius* found three testimonies, to prove, that *Theodorus* being dead, was not to be condemned: The first is out of his Epistle to *Iohn Bishop of Antioch*; where these words are alleaged; When did I write to you, oportere aut Theodorum, aut alias quosdam, qui pridem defuncti sunt, anathemate subdi; that either *Theodorus*, or others, being dead, ought to be anathematized? The second is out of the same Epistle; I rejected indeed those Chapters, (annexed to my Tome) as being impious, neque autem de Theodoro, neque de alio quoquam, qui jam defuncti sunt; but I neither writ of *Theodorus*, nor of any other who is dead, that they should be anathematized, or rejected. The third is out of an Epistle of *Proclus* to *Maximus*; I understand, that the names of *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, and of some other, is prefixed to the Chapters, ad anathematizandum, to bee anathematized, together with the Chapters, cum illi ad Deum jam migrarunt, where, as they are now departed to God, and it is needlesse to injure them, being now dead, quos nec vivos aliquando culpavimus; whom being alive we did never reprove. These are the Popes allegations out of S. *Proclus*, in which I confesse it is clearly taught, that neither any after their death may bee condemned; and particularly that not *Theodorus*, seeing he is gone to God, and was never in his life time once reprov'd.

26. It is a rule in law, semel malus semper presumitur esse malus; He who is once convicted of any crime, is presumed still to be faulty in that kinde. *Vigilius* being lately convicted to commend forgeries for the writings of Fathers, is in reason and equitie to bee thought to alleage such a S. *Proclus*, as before hee did S. *Cyrill*: Nay, there needs no presuming in this matter; there is evident prooffe, and witnesses, above exception, to manifest the same; even the whole fifth generall Councell; who, out of the true, and undoubted writings of *Proclus*, testifie, that *Proclus* taught the quite contrary, both that the dead might, and particularly that *Theodorus* ought to be condemned, and that hee was by *Proclus* himselfe condemned; for in their very Synodall decree, they thus write, Because the disciples of *Theodorus* most evidently opposing the truth (thus sharply do they reprove *Vigilius*) doe alleage certaine sayings of *Cyrill*, and *Proclus*, as written for *Theodorus*; It doth appeare, that those Fathers doe not free him from the Anathema, but speake those things dispensative, by way of dispensation, and in the very words of dispensation they declare of

r Conf. Vig. nu. 174

De regulis juris  
lib. 6. decret. reg. 9.

2 Conc. 5. coll. 8. pa.  
585. b.

of him, *quod oportet anathematizari Theodorum*, that Theodorus ought to be anathematized; adding, that they have demonstrated this, even out of the words of *Cyrill*, and *Proclus*, which they write *ad condemnationē ejus*, for the condemning of Theodorus. Thus writ the Councell, unto which the whole Catholike Church hath ever since subscribed. Seeing then it is certaine that *Proclus* both taught that *Theodorus* ought to be condemned, and did himselfe write to condemne him, there can bee no doubt, but that those Epistles to *Iohn*, and *Maximus*, which *Vigilius* citeth; and wherein *Proclus* is made to avouch the quite contrary, that neither himselfe did, nor that any ought to condemne *Theodorus*, are forged in the name of *Proclus*, by such hands as had wrought the like feat in *Cyrill*: And if either those Epistles were extant, (for in that of *Proclus* to *Iohn*, recorded in the fifth<sup>th</sup> Councell, there is no such thing at all) or, had this *Constitution* of *Vigilius* beene published, and knowne to the Councell before they had fully examined, and cleared this Chapter touching *Theodorus*; it is not to bee doubted, but the one of them, if not both would have discovered this forgery also.

27. Besides all which, there are divers evident prints of a false, and hereticall hand in those Epistles. Is it injury (as that forged *Proclus* affirmeth) to condemne the dead? Nay, it is even hereticall, and that by the judgement of the whole Catholike Church, as before we have proved, to say, that the dead may not be condemned. Had *Proclus* writ, or said this, he had condemned the Councels of *Sardica*, of *Constantinople*, of *Ephesus*, as injurious unto the dead; nor them onely, but he had condemned himselfe, who, as we have now demonstrated, both condemned the dead, and taught, that *Theodorus*, though dead, ought to bee condemned.

28. Did *Theodorus* at his death goe (as this forged *Proclus* affirmeth) to the Lord? a blasphemers, an heretike; equally, by the judgement of *Proclus* himselfe, to the Jewes, and Pagans, and of the same ranke with *Arius*, *Macedonius*, *Ennomius*, and *Nestorius*; such a blaspheming heretike goe unto the Lord? why then did the *Ephesine* Councell, why did Saint *Cyrill*, why did *Proclus* himselfe, adjudge him to bee anathematized, that is, separated from the Lord? Heretikes, and impious persons, as living, they goe not in the wayes of the Lord, but in their owne wayes; so dying, they goe, like *Iudas*, to their owne place; not to the Lord, nor to his habitation, and place of rest; the Saints, and they onely goe that way. To them onely he saith, This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.

29. Was *Theodorus* not so much as blamed; no, not so much as once in his life, as the forged *Proclus* saith? It seemes *Leontius* borrowed his most partiall speech, before mentioned, out of this *Proclus*, and was too credulous unto it: But the true *Proclus* living so neare to the time of *Theodorus*, could not bee ignorant, nor

u Coll. 6. pa. 562.

x Theodorus obiit  
an. 427. Proclus fit  
Episcopus an 434.  
Bar. in illis annis.

nor would ever have uttered so foule an untruth: for although the Church pronounced no publike censure by name against him, yet was he reprov'd and blamed, not onely by others complaining of his erroneous doctrine, but even by *Theophilus B. of Alexandria*, and *Gregory Nisene*. This the fift Councell witnesseth saying<sup>1</sup>, *Saint Theophilus*, and *Saint Gregory Nisene* suscepit querimonias adversus *Theodorum adhuc viventem*, Complaints being brought unto them against *Theodorus of Mopsvestia*, as yet living; and against his writings, scripserunt adversus eum Epistolas, they writ Epistles against him: and in those Epistles (some part whereof is recorded in the Councell) they blame him as presuming to renew the heresie and madnesse of *Paulus Samosatenus*. And it is further added, *perrepta sunt autem*, and the impious chapters collected out of the booke of *Theodorus*, were shewed and brought to *Theophilus*; whence it is now evident, that those Epistles alleaged by *Vigilius* under the name of *Proclus*, are no lesse, by the untrue, and hereticall assertions contained in them, then by the cleare testimonies of the fift generall Councell, convicted offorgery.

y Conc. 5. coll. 5.  
pa. 545. a.

30. From Fathers hee commeth to Councells, and concerning the first *Ephesine*. *Vigilius* noteth two points. The former that *Theodorus* was not condemned by it, to which purpose hee thus saith<sup>2</sup>, *Solicite recensentes, having with diligence, and sollicitude reviewed the Ephesine Synode*: We have found that in it nothing is related touching the person of *Theodorus*. What, nothing? how then did Pope *Pelagius*<sup>3</sup> after *Cyrril*, and the fift Councell finde that in it *Theodorus* was condemned? and if they condemned him, then certainly somewhat was related, & debated about him, upon knowledge whereof the Councell condemned him. But say indeed, is nothing found concerning *Theodorus* in that Councell? What say you to the impious and diabolicall Creed, which was both related<sup>4</sup> in the Synode, and condemned<sup>5</sup> together with the author of it? Truly here *Vigilius* useth a shift, worthy to be observed. That Creed he found, and hee found it to be condemned: but to quite *Theodorus*, hee<sup>6</sup> would have it beleeved, that *Theodorus* was not the author of it; nor that it was condemned, as being the Creed of *Theodorus*, but because it was divulged by certaine Nestorians, *Athanasius*, *Photius*, *Antoninus*, and *Iacobus*. Nor doth *Vigilius* use this shift only about that impious Creed, but in other hereticall writings of *Theodorus*. *Proclus* adjoynded to his Tome certaine impious positions collected of *Theodori codicibus*, as *Cyrril*<sup>7</sup> expressly witnesseth. *Vigilius* likewise of them would have it thought, that they were none of the positions of *Theodorus*, and by the forged Epistles of *Proclus*, hee would perswade<sup>8</sup> that *Proclus* himselfe did not know whose they were. The Emperour *Iustinian* before the Synode began, sent threescore severall hereticall passages or chapters truly gathered out of the booke and writings of *Theodorus*, hoping that

z Vigil. Const. nu.  
173.

a Theodorum mortuum sancta Synodus Ephesina damnavit. Pelag. 2. Epist. 7. S. In his.

b Ad. Ephes. conc. 10. 2. ca. 29, 30, 31, & 33.

c Hoc Symbolum una cum autore Ephesina prima Synodus anathematizavit. conc. 5. coll. 4. pa. 537. a.

d Sed Symbolum quod Chrysostomo prodidit (condemnatum) magis quia ab Athanasio, Photio, &c.

Vigil. const. nu. 173. ubi sententia manet perditionem (condemnatum) aut aliam simile supplenda est.

e Cyrril Epistola ad Acacium, qua eiat. in conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 543.

f Mala que damnaverat, cuius essent, Proclus professus est signorare. Vigil. conc. nu. 175.



that the Pope, seeing *Theodorus* bookes so full fraught with heresies, and blasphemies, would make little doubt to condemne the writer of them. *Vigilius* turnes to his former shift, hee will not thinke, nor have others to thinke that *Theodorus* writ such heresies, though they had his name prefixed unto them: for concerning those 60. chapters (expressed both in the Popes Constitution, and in the Synodall<sup>h</sup> acts) he thus saith<sup>i</sup>; *Wee decree that by those foresaid chapters, nulla injuriandi precedentes partes prabeatur occasio: no occasion be given to injure the former Fathers and Doctors of the Church.* And again<sup>k</sup>, *We provide by this our Constitution, that by these or the like doctrines condemned in Nestorius and Eusebius, no contumely, nor occasion of injury bee brought to those Bishops who have died in the peace of the Catholike Church: and that Vigilius thought Theodorus so to have dyed, we have before<sup>l</sup> declared: yea that Vigilius knew it, Baronius assured us.* Thus *Vigilius* to free *Theodorus* from condemnation, pretends those hereticall writings to be none of his.

31. What is it that *Vigilius* will not say for defence of this blasphemous and condemned heretike? This cavill was used, as *Baronius*<sup>m</sup> tells us, by the old Nestorians and defenders of *Theodorus*, denying those to bee the writings of *Theodorus*, *qua diffamata, which were famously knowne through the whole East: and which being afterwards detected, and discovered to bee truly his writings, both they, and their author with them were condemned.* Now this old hereticall and rejected cavill *Vigilius* here reneweth; those writings famously knowne to be the workes of *Theodorus*, condemned as his writings, and he with them and for the, *Vigilius* will now have thought to be none of his, nor he by them nor for them may bee now condemned. And that you may see how *Vigilius* herein doth strive against the maine streame of the truth. Saint *Cyrill*<sup>n</sup> who then lived, testifieth *Theodorus* to be author of those hereticall and blasphemous writings. That wee have found certaine things in the writings of *Theodorus*, *nimia plena blasphemie, nulli dubium est, full of blasphemy, none that thinks aright can make any doubt.* And againe<sup>o</sup>, Examining the bookes of *Theodorus*, and *Diodorus*, have contradicted them as much as I could, declaring that sect to be every where full of abomination. Yea hee writ divers bookes<sup>p</sup> against *Theodorus*, expressing the words of *Theodorus* and his owne confutation of the same. So cleare, and undoubted was this truth in *Cyrills* dayes, who lived at the same time with *Theodorus*, that hee thought them unwise, who made any doubt of that, which *Vigilius* now calls in question. And particularly touching that impious Creed, *Cyrill* saith<sup>q</sup>, that they who brought it to the Synode of *Ephesus*, said, *that it was composed by Theodorus: which they said not as by way of uncertaine report, but as testifying it to be so, in so much that the whole Synode giving credit thereunto, thereupon condemned Theodorus*<sup>r</sup>, though by a dispensation they expressed not his name.

g Conc. Vig. ann.  
60. ad nu. 173.  
h Conc. 3. coll. 4.  
i Vigil. in const. nu.  
173.  
k nu. 184.

l Sup. ca. 7.

m Defensores Theo-  
dori, ea ipsius scripta  
esse negarunt. Bar.  
an. 433. nu. 14.

n *Cyrill. Epistola ad  
Proclum, citata in  
Conc. 3. coll. 5. pa.  
33c. b.*

o Ibid. pa. 330 d.

p *Qui Cyrilli libri  
citantur saepe in  
Conc. 3. coll. 9. pa.  
338. & seq.*  
q *Proclum apud  
sancti in Synodum  
expositione ab eo  
composita, sicut dice-  
bant, qui protule-  
runt, &c. Verba Cy-  
rilli in Epist. ad Pro-  
clum citat. in Conc.  
3. coll. 5. pa. 350. b.*  
r *Hic condemnatis  
qui sic sapient,  
nullam vii (Theo-  
dori) memoriam fe-  
cerunt. Ibid.*

32 The same is testified by *Rambulas*, *Acatius*, and the whole *Armenian Councell*, who after examination of this cause found the true and indubitate writings of *Theodorus* to be sacrilegious: and therefore by name condemned him, exhorting both *Cyrill* and *Proclus* to doe the like. The *Imperiall Edicts* of *Theodosius*, and *Valentinian* leave no scruple in this matter: who would never have so severely forbidden the memory of *Theodorus*, and the reading or having of his bookes, had it not by evidences undeniable beene knowne, that those were indeed his workes, and hereticall writings. If all these suffice not, when this cause about *Theodorus* was now againe brought into question, the Emperour *Iustinian*, and the fifth Councell, so narrowly and so exactly examined the truth hereof, that after them to make a doubt, is to seeke a knot in a rush. They testifie those very hereticall assertions whereof *Vigilius* doubteth, to be the doctrines and words of *Theodorus*, that impious creed also, whereof *Vigilius* is doubtfull to be composed by *Theodorus*: they are so certaine hereof, that even in their Synodall sentence, they referre the triall of what they decree herein to the true and undoubted bookes of *Theodorus*. And in their sentence is included the judgement of the whole catholike Church, ever since they decreed this which hath with one consent approved their decree.

33 After all these Pope *Pelagius*, in one of his decretall Epistles, wherein at large he handleth this cause, not onely testifieth that impious Creed, and those hereticall writings, to bee the workes of *Theodorus*, alleaging many places of them, but whereas some obstinately addicted to the defence of the three Chapters moved againe this same doubt which *Vigilius* doth; and as is likely by occasion of his decree: *Pelagius* of purpose declareth those to have beene the true writings of *Theodorus*, and consonant to his doctrine; and that hee proveth by the testimonies of the *Armenian Bishops*, of *Proclus*, of *Iohn of Antiach*, of *Cyrill*, of *Rambulas*, of *Honoratus* a Bishop of *Cilicia*, (and so a neighbor of *Mopsuestia* which is in the same Province,) of *Hefychius*, of *Theodosius*, and *Valentinian* the Emperours, and of *Theodoret*, then whom not any (except perhaps *Nestorius*) was more devoted to *Theodorus*; insomuch that he is thought to have taken from *Theodorus* the name of *Theodoret*. After which cloud of witnesses produced, *Pelagius* thus concludeth, blasphemias has ejus esse quis dubitat, who may doubt but that those blasphemies are truly his, (namely of *Theodorus*,) being by so many witnesses declared to be his? Now when Pope *Vigilius* against all these Councells, Bishops, Emperours, Popes, of the same, of succeeding ages, yea against the consenting judgement of the catholike Church, shall not onely doubt, whether *Theodorus* be the author of those hereticall and blasphemous assertions and writings: but by his Apostolicall Constitution decree it to bee an injury to ascribe those blasphemies

f Fiat unitas vestra contra Theodorum, & sacrilega capitula & dogmata ejus. Libell. Episc. Armen. ad Proclam. in Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 542. b.

t De quibus legibus supra, hoc cap. Extra: vero in Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 544.

u Habemus quæ ex Theodori codicibus collegimus. Conc. 5. coll. 4. pa. 527. b. & idem docet Iustin. in suo Edicto. S. Si quis defendit Theodorum.

x Impium Theodorus aliud Symbolum ex posuit. Iust. in Edicto. S. Tali, Et impium ejus (Theodori) Symbolum. coll. 4. pa. 537. a.

y Licet volentibus codices impy Theodori præ manibus accipere, vel quæ ex impy codicibus ejus à nobis inserta hæc gestis sunt. Conc. 5. coll. 3. pa. 585. a. z. Ab ejus (Theodori) discipulis, dictatum ab eo symbolum in eadem Synodo Ephesina prolatum. Pelagius Episc. 7. S. In his.

a Eiusdem Theodori ex libris illius dista replicamus. ibid.

b Hæc Theodori dicta, utrum ejus sint, fortasse dubitatur. ibid. S. Hæc.

c Ibidem. & seq. d Secunda Cilicia, sub qua Mopsuestia constituta est. Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 547. b.

e Episc. 7. S. Epsi.

blasphemies unto him, or for them to condemne him, (as the whole Church, ever since the *Ephesine* Councell hath done) doth it not argue, nay demonstrate an hereticall, and most extreme distemper in the Popes judgment, and in his cathedrall sentence at that time.

f *Vigilius in Const.*  
nu. 173.

34. The other point which *Vigilius* observeth out of the *Ephesine* Councell is worse then this, for as yet he hath onely found that *Theodorus* was not *de facto* condemned by the *Ephesine* Synode; but in the next place, he will finde by that Councell, that *Theodorus*, *de jure* ought not to bee condemned. To which purpose he saith <sup>f</sup>, that *Cyrril* (and so the *Ephesine* Synode consenting to him as President) would not have the name of *Theodorus* contained in the Synodall Acts at *Ephesus*: *propter regulam qua de mortuis in sacerdotio servanda est*, for the rule which is to bee kept in such Bishops as are dead. And that rule he explaines in the words following, to be this, that the dead should not bee condemned, nor should the living bend their bow against ashes, or insult over the dead, whereby *Vigilius* even by his *Apostolicall* decree, adjudgeth both *Cyrril*, and the whole *Ephesine* Councell consenting therein with him, to have beleevd and held a condemned heresie, as an Ecclesiasticall rule, or rule of their faith and actions; That one who is dead may not bee condemned: and so by the Popes Constitution both *Cyrril* and the holy *Ephesine* Synode were heretikes. Such worthy points doe the Popes finde when they use their art, and industry, to review ancient writings, with a reference to their owne determinations, and so easie was it for *Vigilius* to finde the *Ephesine* Councell, first injurious to the dead, and then hereticall in a doctrine or rule concerning the dead.

g *Vigil. in Const.*  
nu. 145.

35. The very like he found also in the Councell of *Chalcedon*, that *Theodorus* ought not to be condemned. His reason is this, *Iohn* Bishop of *Antioch*, writ a letter to the Emperour *Theodosius* in excuse of *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, *ne post mortem damnari deberet*, that he ought not to bee condemned after his death. Now this letter of *Iohn*, *Venerabiliter memoratur*, is with honour, (not onely with allowance and liking) remembred by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, in their Relation, or Synodall Epistle to the Emperour *Martianus*. Whence *Vigilius* collecteth, that seeing the Councell with reverence, embraceth that letter of *Iohn*, and that letter importeth, that *Theodorus* being dead, ought not to be condemned; therefore the Councell judgeth that none who are dead, and particularly, that *Theodorus* ought not to bee condemned: which reason of *Vigilius* was borrowed from other Nestorians, and defenders of the three Chapters, as appeareth by *Liberatus*, who explaineth it, and sets <sup>h</sup> it downe almost *totidem verbis*: *Iohn* saith he, writ three letters in the behalfe of *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, praising in them *Theodorus*, and declaring his wisdom; one of those letters he sent to the Emperour *Theodosius*, another

h *Liber. ca. 10.*



to *Cyrril*, the third to *Proclus*. Now the first, and third, containing the praises of *Theodorus*, the Councell of *Chalcedon*, in their Relation to *Martianus* the Emperour, did embrace, and confirme. Thus *Liberatus* agreeing wholly herein, as you see, with *Vigilius*.

i Duas Iohannis  
Epistolae laudes  
Theodori continen-  
tes, Chalced. Synod.  
suscepit, et confir-  
mavit. Ibid.

36. For answer of which reason of *Vigilius*, I will intreat you to spare my labour, and heare how fully, and soundly *Cardinall Baronius* doth refute it; but yet so, that hee will not seeme to taxe, or touch *Vigilius*; that had beene great insolency, and incivilitie in a *Cardinall*; but he payes the *Deacon* home to the full, who saith but the very same with the Pope: *Liberatus*, saith hee, borrowed this narration of I know not what *Nestorian*, & incaute nimis; and he affirms too indiscreetly, that the writings of *Theodorus* were praised in the letters of *Iohn*, Bishop of *Antioch*; and, which is farre worse, that those letters of *Iohn*, containing the praises of *Theodorus*, were received, and confirmed by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, in their Relation to *Martianus*; for by that meanes, adducit in idem crimen, he makes the whole Councell of *Chalcedon* guilty of the same crime; to wit, of approving the praises & doctrine of *Theodorus*. So *Baronius*. By who it is cleare, that *Vigilius* (saying the same w<sup>th</sup> *Liberatus*) makes the whole Councell of *Chalcedon* guilty of the same crime; that is, in plaine termes avoucheth them to be hereticall: *Videsne*, saith the *Cardinall*, quot, & quales lateant colubri sub uno cespite? Doe not you see how many, and how vile, and venomous snakes lye hid under this one turfe, or tuft of untruth? And that very tuft, hath Pope *Vigilius* chosen to build up, and beautifie with it his *Apostolicall* decree. Now, if under that one turfe there lurke (as indeed there doth, and the *Cardinall* acknowledgeth,) so great a number of *Vipers*; what infinite, and innumerable heapes of most deadly, and poisonfull untruths, are compacted into the whole body of his *Apostolicall* Constitution, which containeth (if one listed narrowly to examine it) more than a thousand like turfes; nay, beyond comparison worse than this.

k Bar. an. 435. un.  
11.

1 Ibid.

37. But the *Cardinall* hath not yet done with *Liberatus*; Let us, saith hee, put the Axe to the roote of the tree; and citing the very words of the Councell, and their Relation to *Martianus*, he addeth, You see that here is no mention at all of *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*; which reason of *Baronius*, *Binius* explaneth, saying, That which *Liberatus* affirmeth, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* received the praises of *Theodorus*, is not onely untrue, sed etiam ipsi relationi Synodica contraria; but it is plainly contrary to the Synodall Relation of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, to which *Liberatus* referreth himselfe: Change but the name, and all this is everie whit as forcible against *Vigilius*, as against *Liberatus*. But the *Cardinall* had well learned the old lesson, Dat veniam corvis vexat censura columbas; the Pope offends more than any, but the poore *Deacon* must feele the smart, and beare all the blowes; and yet by

m Bar. ibid. et  
nu. 12.

n Binius notus in Libe-  
rati. & Brevia-  
rium hoc.

your leave, through the Deacons sides the Cardinall hath cunningly given a deadly wound, and cut the very roote of the Popes *Apostolicall* decree; although he will not bee thought so unmannerly, as once to touch his Holinesse, or speake one syllable against him.

38. After Fathers, and Councils, *Vigilius* will next finde, that the Emperour *Iustinian* himselfe, who was so earnest in condemning *Theodorus*; doth yet teach, that *Theodorus* ought not to bee condemned; and how proves hee this? You, saith *Vigilius* to the Emperour, *laudabiliter adduxistis, have with praise and approbation alleaged* that Relation of the Councell of *Chalcedon* in your law, *de sancta Trinitate*. Seeing then that Relation of the Councell approveth the letters of *Iohn*, and the letters of *Iohn*, shew, that *Theodorus* being dead, ought not to bee condemned; the Pope from hence inferreth, that by *Iustinians* own law approving that Relation, *Theodorus* ought not to be condemned. It were very easie with *Baronius* Hatchet to chop off this reason, and cut it up by the roote, seeing neither *Iohns* letters did teach that *Theodorus*, being dead, might not be condemned; nor did the Councell, in their Relation approve, either the person, or doctrine, or any praises of *Theodorus*, or so much as mention him: But I will not trouble the Cardinall in so easie a matter as this. Besides all the inconsequences in this reason, *Iustinian* is so farre from teaching, or thinking this, so much as in a deeme, that in the same ritle, *de Summa Trinitate, & fide Catholica*, (which seemes to be that which *Vigilius* intended) he accurseth all heresies, and specially that of *Nestorius*; and all, *qui eadem cum ipso sentiunt, vel senserunt; who either doe thinke, or have thought as Nestorius did*; in which number *Theodorus* of *Mosopvestia* to be comprehended, not onely by that which we have said before, is manifest, but even by *Iustinian* himselfe, who expressly witnesseth, *Theodorus* to have thought so, and to have dyed in that hereticall opinion; and for that very cause doth he condemne, and accurse him. Now seeing that law, *de Summa Trinitate*, was published in the seventh yeare of *Iustinians* raigne; (as by the date appeareth) and sent into twelve severall Provinces, seeing, after this, *Iustinian*, in his twentieth yeare, set forth another Edict concerning these three Chapters, wherein he particularly, and by name anathematizeth *Theodorus*; nor him onely, but all that defend him; yea; all, who doe not anathematize him; out of which number *Vigilius* himselfe is not exempted, seeing he remained so constant in this trieth, that after *Vigilius* had published his Constitution, both himselfe signified to the fift Councell, that he still persisted in condemning the three Chapters, one of which was the condemning of *Theodorus*; and the whole fift Synod testified the same, saying in their seventh Collation, *semper fecit, & facit, the Emperour hath ever done, and now continueth to doe, that which preserveth the holy Church, and true faith*: Was it not a very strange thing in *Vigilius* to pretend in his Constitution, that by the Empe-

o In Const. nu. 175.

p In Cod. Iust. leg. 6. tit. de Summa Trin.

q Theodorus hereticos omnes impietate superas, &c. Iust. in edit. § Tali. r Iste autem (Theodorus) usque ad mortem in sua permanens impietate. Ibid.

s Quod autem. f Datum Iustiniano August. 3. Coss.

Is vero est annus Iustiniani, ut docet Marcell. in Chro. et Bar. in eum an. nu. 1.

t Pt ait Baran. 546 nu. 8.

u Edictum hoc de quo toties mentionem fecimus.

y Iust. Edict § Si quis defendit Theodorum.

z Pa. 582. b.

rours owne law, *Theodorus* ought not be condemned; whereas by the Emperours Edict, not onely *Theodorus* by name, but all, who defend him, even *Vigilius* himselfe, *eo nomine*, because he defendeth him, is condemned, and anathematized.

39. And now you have seene all that *Vigilius* bringeth for defence of *Theodorus*, all that hee found after his most diligent search of the Fathers, Councils, and ancient writings, whereby I doubt not but it is evident unto all, that Nestorianisme had either quite blinded, the Pope, or at least induced him to play (which he hath done very skilfully) one of the *Lamia* in this cause; when ought that tended to the truth, came in his way, and offered it selfe unto him; he then lockt up his eyes, and kept them fast in a basket; but when, or where ought that tended to Nestorianisme, and the defence of a condemned heretike, might in a likelihood be found, then he put his eyes in his head, and became as quicksighted, as the Serpent of *Epidaurus*. The writings of *Cyrril*, and *Proclus*, condemning *Theodorus* for an heretike, worse than either Jew, or Pagan, the Councils of *Ephesus*, of *Armenia*, of *Chalcedon*, anathematizing him; the Imperiall lawes of *Theodosius*, commanding all memory of him to bee abolished, & his heretical books to be burned; the expunging his name out of the Ecclesiasticall tables, even in that Church, where hee had beene Bishop, and a number the like; none of all these could *Vigilius*, in his most diligent inquisition, finde or see; why, the *Lamia* had lockt up his eyes against all these publike, and known evidences, and records. But when the base Counterfeits, forged in the name of *Cyrril*, and *Proclus*, when the depraving, or calumniating the Councils of *Ephesus*, of *Chalcedon*, and of *Iustinian*, as being maintainers of a condemned heresie: when these, or the like might be found, oh the Pope saw these at the first; his eyes were now as cleare, as the sight of *Lincens*, he could spie these through a Millstone; nay, which is more, hee could see them, though there were no such matters at all to bee seene: And truly, if you well consider, there was good reason why hee should see the one, and not the other: For the Pope saw the Epistle of *Ibas* to bee orthodoxall, and to be approved by the Councell of *Chalcedon*; he saw in that Epistle *Theodorus* to be called a Saint, a Preacher of the truth, a Doctor of the Church; Now it had beene an exceeding incongruity, to see a condemned Saint, an accursed Saint, an hereticall, or blasphemous Saint; It was not for the Popes wisdom to see such a Saint, and therefore at all such sights, up with the eyes, locke them fast, that they see none of those ugly, and offensive sights; nothing of the condemning, of the accursing, of the heresies, and blasphemies of *Theodorus*. So bewitched was the Pope with Nestorianisme at this time, that it had the whole command of his heart, of his eyes, of his sense, of his understanding; it opened, and shut them all whensoever it listed.

*a. Quodrum unus est  
beatus Theodorus  
viridatis predica-  
tor, et doctor Ecclē-  
sie. Epist. Jba in  
Conf. Chal. AB. 10.  
pa. 113. b.*



40. I have stayed too long, I feare, in examining this first Chapter, touching *Theodorus*; but I was very loath to let any materiall point passe, without due triall, or before I had shaken a sunder every joint, and parcell of the Popes Constitution in this cause, and fully manifested, how erroneous his Apostolicall decree is, as well in doctrinall, as personall matters. That *Theodorus* was dead, is personall; but that none after death may bee condemned for an heretike, is doctrinall; yea, an heresie in the doctrine of faith. That *Theodorus* dyed in the peace of the Church, is an error personall; but that *Theodorus* therefore dyed in the peace of the Church, because he was not in his life time condemned by the expresse sentence of the Church; or, that any dying in heresie, as *Theodorus* did, doe die in the peace of the Church, are errors doctrinall. That *Theodorus* was not by the former Fathers, and Councils condēned, is a personall error; but that *Theodorus* by the judgement of the Fathers, & Councils, ought not after his death to be condemned, is doctrinall; even a condemning of the Councils of *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*, as guilty of beleeving, and teaching an heresie. So many wayes is the Popes sentence, in this first Chapter, erroneous in faith; of which *Baronius* most vainely pretendeth, that it is no cause of faith, no such cause as doth concerne the faith.

41. There now remaineth nothing of *Vigilius* decree concerning this first Chapter, but his conclusion of the same: And although that must needs of it selfe fall downe, when all the reasons, on which it relyeth, and by which onely it is supported, are ruinated, or overthrowne; yet if you please, let us take a short view of it also, rather to explaine, than refute the same. His conclusion hath two branches, the former is, that in regard of the foresaid reasons, *nostrā cum non audemus damnare sententia*; we dare not condemne *Theodorus* by our sentence; we dare not doe it, faith *Vigilius*.

42. Oh how faint-hearted, pusillanimous, and dastardly was the Pope in this cause; *Cyrill*, the head of the generall Councell: *Proclus*, a most holy Bishop, whose Epistle, as *Liberatus* saith, the Councell of *Chalcedon* approved: *Rambulas*, the pillar of the Church: the religious Emperours *Theodosius*, and *Valentinian*; the Church of *Mosuestia*, the Councils of *Ephesus*, of *Armenia*, of *Chalcedon*, the whole Catholike Church ever since the *Ephesine* Synod, both durst, and did condemne *Theodorus*: and, besides these, *Baronius*, and *Binius*, two of the most artificiall Gnathonizing Parasites of the Pope, even they durst, and did, even in setting downe the very Constitution of *Vigilius*, call *Theodorus*, more than forty times, an heretike, a craftie, impious, madde, prophane, blasphemous, execrable heretike; onely Pope *Vigilius* hath nor the heart, nor courage; hee onely with his sectators, dare not call him, nor cōdemne him for an heretike; we dare not condemne him by our sentence.

43. And

b Vig. Const. nu. 179

c Sanctissimorum  
Episcoporum hic co-  
actum caput Cy-  
rillum, &c. Epist.  
Synod. Ephes. to. 4.  
Act. Conc. Ephes.  
ca. 8.  
d Cyrill. epist. ad A-  
nat. in Cons. coll. 5.  
pa. 543. a. Dominus  
meus sanctissimus  
Episcopus Proclus.  
e Lib. ca. 10.  
f Rufinus, hereti-  
cus, blasphemus, &c.  
Bar. an. 553. nu.  
320. et seq. et Bin.  
pa. 595. et seq.

43. And yet when *Vigilius* saw good, hee who durst not doe this, durst doe a greater matter, he durst doe that which not any of all the former, nay which they all put together, never durst doe. *Vigilius* durst defend both an heresie, and a condemned and anathematized heretike, he durst commend forged, and hereticall writings, under the name of holy Fathers, hee durst approve that Epistle, wherein an heretike is called, and honoured for a Saint; he durst, contrary to the Imperiall and godly Edict of *Theodosius*, contrary to the judgements of the holy generall Councils, defend *Theodorus*, honor his memorie, yea honor him as a teacher of truth while he lived, as a Saint being dead. These things none of all the former ever durst doe: in these *Vigilius* is more bold and audacious then they are all.

44. Whence thinke you proceeded this contrariety of passions in *Vigilius*, that made him sometimes more bold, then a Lyon, and other times more timorous then an Hare? Truly even from hence: As *Vigilius* had no eyes to see ought, but what favored Nestorianisme, so hee had not the heart to doe ought which did not uphold Nestorianisme. If a Catholike truth met him, or the sweet influence thereof hapned to breath upon him, *Vigilius* could not endure it, the Popes heart fainted at the smell thereof: but when the Nestorian heresie blew upon him, when being full with *Nestorius* he might say, *agis ante calefactum illo*, not *Ajax*, not *Polyphemus* so bold nor full of courage as Pope *Vigilius*. As the Scarabee or beetle is said to feed on dung, but to dye at the sent of a Rose: So the filth of Nestorianisme was meat, and drinke to the Pope, it was *vita vivacium* unto him, but the fragrant and most odoriferous sent of the catholike truth, was poison, it was even death to this Beetle. So truly was it fulfilled in him, which the Prophet saith <sup>h</sup>, *they bend their tongues for lyes, but they have no courage for the truth*: we dare not condemne *Theodorus* by our sentence.

g Pier. Hierog.  
lib. 55.

h Jer. 9. 3.

45. The other branch of the Popes conclusion is, *Sed nec ab alio quopiam condemnari concedimus*, neither doe wee permit that any other shall condemne *Theodorus*: Nay we decree <sup>k</sup> that none else shall speake, write, or teach otherwise, then we doe herein. As much in effect, as if the Pope had definitively decreed, wee permit, or suffer no man whatsoever, to teach or beleve what *Cyrill*, what *Proclus*, what the whole generall Councils of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*: that is, what all Catholikes, and the whole Catholike Church hath done, taught and beleaved: we permit, nay we command, and by this our *Apostolicall Constitution*, decree, that they shall be heretikes, and defend both an heresie, (that no dead man may be condemned) and condemned heretikes, in defending *Theodorus*, yea defending him for a Saint, and teacher of truth: This we permit, command, and decree, that they shall doe; but to doe otherwise, to condemne *Theodorus*, or a dead man, that by no meanes doe we permit or suffer it to bee lawfull unto them.

i Vig. Conf. nu. 179

k Vig. Conf. nu. 108

46. And as if all this were not sufficient, the Pope addes one other clause more execrable, then all the former, for having recited those three hereticall assertions, which as we have declared, were all collected out of the true, and indubitate writings of Theodorus, he adjoynes, *Anathematizamus omnem, wee accurse and anathematize every man pertaining to orders, who shall ascribe or impute any continually, to the Fathers, and Doctors of the Church, by those forenamed impieties: and if no Father, then not Theodorus for those may be condemned. See now, unto what height of impiety, the Pope is ascended, for it is as much as if hee had said, Wee anathematize, and accurse Saint Cyrill, Saint Prich, Saint Ambulus, Saint Irenaeus, the Synode of Armenia, the generall Councells of Ephesus, of Chalcedon, of Constantinople in the time of Iustinian; yea even the whole catholike Church, which hath approved those holy Councells: all these out of those very impieties, which Vigilius mentioneth, have condemned Theodorus, them all for wronging, and condemning Theodorus for those impieties, we doe anathematize, and accurse, saith Vigilius.*

47. Consider now seriously with your selves of what faith and religion they are, who hold (and so doe all the members of the present Romane Church,) this for a position or foundation of faith, that whatsoever any Pope doth judicially, and by his apostolike authority define in such causes, is true, is infallible, is with certainty of faith to bee believed and embraced: Let all the rest be omitted, embrace but this one decree of Vigilius, nay but this one passage or parcel of his decree touching this first Chapter which concernes Theodorus, yet by approving this one, they demonstrate themselves, not onely to renounce, but with Vigilius to condemne, accurse, and anathematize both the Catholike faith, and the Catholike Church: yea to accurse all who doe not accurse them, which because none but Anti-Christ, and his hereticall adherents can doe; they demonstrate againe hereby their Church to bee hereticall, catholike, and Anti-Christiian, such as not onely hateth, but accurseth the holy, and truly Catholike Church of Christ. *But the curse that is causesse shall not come.* Nay, God doth, and for ever will turne their cursings into blessings. *Blessed are ye, when for my sake, (for professing and maintaining my truth) men revile you, and speake evil of you.* Let Balak hire with himselfe of gold: Let the Romane Balaam for the wages of iniquity attempt never so oft, on this hill, on that mountain, or wheresoever hee sets up his altar to curse the Church of GOD, the Lord will turne the curse into a blessing upon them: *For there is no sorcery against Israel; no curse, no charme, nor incantation, against Israel.* Nay their curses shall fall on their owne heads and returne into their owne bosomes, but peace, and the blessings of peace shall bee upon Israel. For

Blessed

1 Vig Conf. nu. 173.

in Prov. 16.2.

in Ma' 5. 11.

o Deut. 23. 5.

p Numb. 23. 23.



blessed & shall bee blest in thee, and cursed is hee that curseth thee. q Numb. 24. 9.

## CHAP. IX.

That Vigilius besides divers personall, held a doctrinall error in faith, in his defence of the second Chapter, which concerns the writings of Theodore against Cyrill.



Here was some shadow of reason to thinke, that the former Chapter was a personall matter; seeing that was indeed moved concerning the person of *Theodore*. But in the two other, there is no pretence, or colour for *Baronius* to say, that in them the question, or cause was personall, and not wholly doctrinall; who in all the fift Council once doubted of the persons of *Theodore*, or *Ibas*, whether they were Catholikes, after their anathematizing of *Nestorius* in the Council of *Chalcedon*? The onely question about them was, whether the writings of *Theodore* against *Cyrill* were to bee condemned, which the Pope denyeth, and the holy Council affirmeth, and whether the Epistle of *Ibas* was Orthodoxall, or he by unknown to be Orthodoxall, which the Pope affirmeth, and the holy Council denyeth. The question about them, no way concerned their persons, but onely their writings. And it might be a wonder that *Baronius* should have the face to say, that the cause in these two Chapters was onely personall, if it were not daily seene by experience that *necessitas cogit ad turpia*, mere necessity enforced the Cardinall to use any though never so untrue, never so unlikely excuses for *Vigilius*.

2. There are I confesse divers personall matters, and questions of facts, which concernes both these Chapters: and although they were not the controversies moved, and debated, betwixt the defenders, and the oppugners of those Chapters; yet is it needfull to say somewhat of them also, partly for more illustration of the cause of faith, & specially that we may see how foully *Vigilius* and *Baronius* have erred, not onely in doctrinall causes, which are more obscure, but even in those personall matters, which had beene easie, and obvious, if they had not shut their eyes against the truth.

3. Concerning the second Chapter, the Popes decree herein relyeth, and is grounded, on three personall points, or matters of fact. The first is, that *Vigilius* would perswade, that *Theodore* was not the author of those writings against *Cyrill*, and against his twelve Chapters or Anathematizings, which containing a just condemnation of the twelve heretick assertions of *Nesto-*

a Ex tractu in dñm  
Conc. Ephes. to. 1. ca.  
24. et 10m. 5. ca. 1.

rius;

b Ibid. 16. 5. ca. 2.  
S. Ego vera. Et Liber.  
ca. 6.

c Act. 5. in definit.  
fidei.

d Vigil. Constit. nu.  
180.

e Ibid. nu. 181.

f Ibid.

rites, were approved both by the Council of Ephesus<sup>b</sup> and Chalcedon<sup>c</sup>. To which purpose he calls them not *Theodorets*, but writings, *quod sub Theodoreti nomine proferuntur*, which are set forth under the name of *Theodore*. And againe, the reprove of the 12. Chapters of *Cyrril*: *à Theodoreto* <sup>e</sup> *ut putatur ingesta*, made as is thought by *Theodore*: adding<sup>f</sup> this as one reason, why the Council of Chalcedon, did not cōdemne those writings, because they having those matters which were done but of late before their eyes, *Theodoretum nihil tale fecisse probaverunt*, did judge that *Theodore* had written no such thing. Thus *Vigilius* pretending those writings against *Cyrril* not to be *Theodorets*, and that the Council of Chalcedon also thought the same; whence he would inferre, (and justly upon this supposall) that *Theodorets* name ought not to bee blemished by those writings which were none of his.

4. Nor his? why *Theodore* is knowne, and testified by so many, to have beene so eager and violent in defence of *Nestorius*, and his heresie, and so spirefull both in words, and writings against *Cyrril*, and all orthodoxall professors of that time, that it were more strange if *Vigilius* was ignorant of this, then that knowing it he should deny, or make a doubt thereof. Witnesse *Binius*, *Iohn* of *Antioch*, saith he, <sup>g</sup> *persuaded Theodore*, that he should wish all his art and skill appugne and refute those 12. Anathematizmes of *Cyrril*. *Theodore* being as much an enemy to *Cyrril*, as was *Iohn* himselfe, willingly yeelded to his petition, and by manifest sycophancy wrested every one of *Cyrril*s Chapters from their true, genuine, and orthodoxall, to a false, preposterous, and hereticall sense, and *Eusebius* sent that refutation of *Theodore* unto *Cyrril*. Againe, <sup>h</sup> *Theodore* did once defend *Theodorus* and *Nestorius*, two most pestiferous Arch-heretikes against *Cyrril*. Yea *Binius* saith, *defendit constantissime*, he defended them most constantly, as if to defend heresie, were with these men not pertinacie, but constancy, witnesse *Baronius*. *Theodore* saith he <sup>i</sup> being most addicted to *Theodorus*, shadowed his praise, by his friendship with *Nestorius*, but he utterly darkned it by his undertaking of the defence of that Arch-heretike against *Cyrril*. And againe <sup>k</sup>, *Theodore* being at that time the patron of *Nestorius*, and an oppugner of the Catholike faith, sheweth his darts against the Chapters of *Cyrril*, and by new writings doth oppugne them; crying out in his letters to the Bishops of *Milaine* of *Aquileia*, and of *Ravenna*, that *Cyrril* renewed the heresie of *Apollinaris*.

Witnesse (men of better note then the former) *Liberatus*, who saith, <sup>l</sup> that *Iohn* of *Antioch* commanded two Bishops, *Andreas* & *Theodore*, that they should write against the 12. Chapters of *Cyrril*, blaming him as one who renewed the heresie of *Apollinaris*: and that *Theodore* consented, the event made manifest. Pope *Pelagius*, who saith <sup>m</sup> that *Theodore*, *monstratur scripsisse*, is demonstrated and certainly knowne to have written against the twelve Chapters of *Cyrril*, and against the true Faith.

The

g Bin. in argumentis  
ca. 2. Append. ad 10.  
5. Act. Conc. Ephes.  
pa. 859.

h Bin. not in Epist.  
Leonis. 61. to. 1.  
Conc. pa. 971.

i Bar. an. 427.  
nu. 30.

k an. 431. nu. 181.

l Liber. ca. 4.

m Pelag. 2. Epist. 7.  
S. Discussio.

The Acts of the Ephesine Councell, wherein <sup>a</sup> is recorded the verie refutation of those twelve Chapters by *Theodoret*, and the answer of *Cyrrill* unto it; the one still called, *Theodoret's reprehensio*; and the other, *Cyrrilli adversus Theodoretum refutatio*; *Cyrrill*, who, in his Epistle <sup>b</sup> to *Eulogius*, saith thus, You have my refutation which I set forth against *Andreas*, and *Theodoret*, who writ against my Chapters.

<sup>n</sup> Reprehensio 12.  
Capitulum, divi  
Cyrrilli à Theodoret  
to co. scripta, habet  
etur in Append.  
ad to. 5. Act. Conc.  
Eph. ca. 2. pa. 859. b.  
o Cyrrill. Epist. ad  
Eulog. extat. to. 5.  
Act. Conc. Eph. c. 8.

6. Witnesse *Theodoret* himselfe, who, in sundrie of his Epistles, testifieth his spleene, and spight against *Cyrrill*, and the Catholike faith. In <sup>p</sup> one of them to *Nestorius* he professeth his most perverse, and pertinacious resolution to abide in that heresie of *Nestorius*; I wil never, saith he, while I live, consent to those things which are done against you, and against the law: (so hee taxeth, not onely the Chapters of *Cyrrill*, but the decree of the holy Ephesine Synod) no, I will not consent unto them, though they should cut off both my hands. In another to *Iohn*, the Bishop of *Antioch*; We <sup>q</sup> continue still, saith he, contradicting the twelve Chapters, ut alienis à pietate, as being contrary to pietie: In another to *Emeritus*, We ought not to consent to the condemnation of the venerable, and most holy Bishop *Nestorius*: in another to <sup>r</sup> *Alexander*, I told you before, that the doctrine of my venerable, and most holy Bishop *Nestorius* hath beene condemned; nec ego, cum his qui faciunt, communicabo; neither will I communicate with those who condemned that doctrine: and yet more bitterly in his Epistle to <sup>s</sup> *Andreas*, his fellow-oppugner of those Chapters. Insanit iterum *Aegyptus* adversus Deum; *Aegypt* is againe madde against the Lord, and makes warre with *Moses*, and *Aaron*, the servants of God: As if *Nestorius*, and his fellow-heretikes were the onely Israel; but *Cyrrill*, Bishop of *Alexandria* in *Aegypt*; and the holy Ephesine Councell, and all Catholikes who held with them, were no other but *Pharao*, and his *Aegyptian* troupes, which fought against GODS people.

<sup>p</sup> Extat in Conc. 5.  
coll. 5. pa. 559. a.

<sup>q</sup> Extat et citat. ib.

<sup>r</sup> Ea citatur à Pe-  
ludio, Epist. 7. § Dif-  
cussio.  
<sup>s</sup> Citatur ibid.

<sup>t</sup> Extat in Conc. 5.  
coll. 5. pa. 558. b.

7. Doe we yet desire more, or more pregnant, and ample testimonies in this matter? Take this one out of the acts of *Chalcedon*: When *Theodoret*, being called, came first into the Synod, the most reverend Bishops of *Aegypt*, *Illirium*, and <sup>u</sup> *Palestine*, cryed out against him in this manner; The Canons exclude this man, thrust him out, *Magistrum Nestorij foras mittite*; thrust out the master of *Nestorius*: the orthodoxall Councell doth not receive *Theodoret*: Call him not a Bishop, he is no Bishop, hee is an oppugner of God, he is a Jew, thrust him out: he accused, he anathematized *Cyrrill*, if we receive him, we reject *Cyrrill*; The Canons exclude him, God doth detest him. Thus cryed out the Bishops against *Theodoret*, before they knew him to have renounced the heresie of *Nestorius*, which he had so long, and so eagerly defended: nor were they pacified otherwise, but that *Theodoret*, at the appointment of the Iudges, should sit onely as an accuser of *Dioscorus*, nor as one having judicatorie power, or a decisive suffrage, till his owne cause

<sup>u</sup> Conc. Chal. Act. 1.  
pa. 6. a.



cause was fully examined, and heard. Seeing now there are besides, many other which I willingly omit, so many, so evident, so obvious, so undeniable proofes, that *Theodoret* writ against *Cy-  
rill*, and against his twelve Chapters, in defence of *Nestorius*, and his heresie; what can one thinke of *Vigilius*, but that he willfully, and wittingly resisted the truth, while he, not onely strives to perswade, that *Theodoret* writ no such thing, and that the Councell of *Chalcedon* thought so; but takes this knowne, and palpable untruth, for one of the grounds of his *Apostolicall* decree touching this second Chapter.

8. And yet there is a worse matter in this very passage of *Vigilius*, and that is, the reason whereby he proveth, that *Theodoret* writ not against *Cy-  
rill*, or in defence of *Nestorius*; you shall heare it in his owne words: It is, saith he, undoubtedly repugnant to the judgement of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, that any *Nestorian doctrine* should be condemned under the name of that Bishop (*Theodoret*) who, together with those holy Fathers, did accuse the doctrines of *Nestorius*: *Quidem aliud est mendaces, & simulantes professionem rectæ fidei patres in sancto Concilio Chalcedonensi residentes ostendere, quam dicere aliquos ex his similia sapuisse Nestorio*: for to say, that any of them who were in that Councell, had thought as *Nestorius* did, is nothing else then to shew or affirme those Fathers in the Councell of *Chalcedon* to be lyers, and dissemblers in faith, as condemning that faith which they doe allow. Thus reasoneth *Vigilius*, who hence implyeth, that seeing *Theodoret* was one of the Bishops, and Fathers at *Chalcedon*, if he ever writ any such things in defence of *Nestorius*, then both he, and the rest admitting him, should dissemble in their faith, and lye, professing to condemne *Nestorius*, and yet approving him, who had writ in defence of *Nestorius*.

9. Truly I doe even admire, to consider the blindness of *Vigilius* in this whole cause of the three Chapters. Most certaine it is, as we have shewed, that *Theodoret* did both thinke as *Nestorius*, and write in defence of him, and his heresie, and that the Councell of *Chalcedon* knew he did so: If then to receive such an one, as they knew *Theodoret* to have beene, be, as *Vigilius* saith, a dissembling, and lying in the faith; the whole Councell of *Chalcedon*, by the Popes judgement, and decree, were undoubtedly all lyers, and dissemblers in the faith; a calumnie and slander so vile, and incredible, that it alone should cause any Catholike minde to detest this *Apostolicall Constitution* of *Vigilius*: But to say truth, the Popes reason is without al reason. Had the holy Councell admitted *Theodoret* before he had renounced his heresie, or manifested the sincerity of his faith unto them, the Pope might have had some colour to have accused them of dissembling, as condemning *Nestorianisme*, & yet receiving a known *Nestorian* into their communion: but it was quite contrary. In the former actions, till *Theodoret* had cleared himselfe of heresie, hee was, as we have declared, no otherwise admitted, than onely as a plain-  
tiffe,

x *Vigil. Const.*  
nu. 180.

nisse, who & accused Dioscorus for injuriously deposing him, and placing another in his See. And in the eight Action, wherein hee came to cleare himselfe, and to be reconciled to the Church, he had no sooner almost set his foot in the Synod, but the Bishops cryed out, *Theodoretus modo anathematizet Nestorium*; let Theodoret forthwith anathematize Nestorius: let him doe it instantly and without any delay. And when Theodoret to give the Councell better satisfaction offered them first a book to reade containing the sincere profession of his faith; and when (that being refused) he purposed at large by words<sup>b</sup> to have expressed the same; the Synod suspecting the worst, and that hee used those delayes, as being loath to anathematize Nestorius, cryed out, *He is an heretike, he is a Nestorian, hereticum foras mitte, out with the heretike*; and so they had indeed thrust him out, but that he leaving all circuition, presently before them all, cryed, *Anathema to Nestorius*; *Anathema to him, who doth not confesse the blessed Virgin to bee the Mother of God*; with which profession the Synod being fully satisfied, the glorious Iudges said, *omnis dubitatio*, now all doubt is quite taken away concerning Theodoret; and then the Synod both received him into their communion, as an orthodoxe, and restored him to his See, from which in the Ephesine latrocinie, hee was deposed, they all crying out, *Theodoret is worthy of his See*; let his Church receive their orthodoxall Bishop: To Theodoret, a Catholike Doctor, let the Church be restored.

10. What greater detestation of heresie could the Synod possibly shew, what greater tokens of the sinceritie of his faith, could either Theodoret expresse, or the Synod require. It was too great rashnesse, if not simplicitie in Vigilins to collect that the holy Councell did dissemble in their faith, because they received him who had sometimes swayed in the faith; The hereticall Theodoret, they exclude and reject, the orthodoxall Theodoret they reverence and embrace. That which Saint Austen<sup>c</sup> saith in another cause, that the husband who had put away his adulterous wife, ought againe to receive her being purged by unsained repentance, but so receive her, *non ut post viri divortium adultera revocetur, sed ut post Christi consortium adultera non revocetur*, that same may bee accommodated to any other offence, and not unfitly to this of heresie, and the repentant hereticke; whom they before, for that cause had from themselves disioyned; but they neither call, nor count him an hereticke, whom Christ hath now upon his repentance unto himselfe conjoynd. So neither is the Popes reason consequent, that the Councell did dissemble in their receiving of Theodoret, nor his conclusion true, which he would thence inferre, that Theodoret writ not against Cyrill and the Catholike faith.

11 The second personall matter which Vigilins taketh for another ground of his decree is, that neither Theodoret himselfe did, nor did the Councell of Chalcedon, require him to anathematize

y Gloriosiss. Iudici dixerunt, Theodoretus in locum accusatoris nunc ingressus est, unde patiamini ea quae inchoata sunt finire, reservata post hac omni accusatione, et vobis, et illi. Cons. Chal. act. 1. pa. 6. a.  
z Act. 8. Conc. Chal. a Nihil relegi volumus, anathematizet Nestorium. Ib. b Ego inquit Theodoretus quomodo crido, &c. ib. d.

c Aug. lib. 2. de Adulter. conjug. ca. 9.

*¶ Vig. Conf. nu.  
180.*

*¶ Ibid. nu. 181.*

*¶ Ego autem et de-  
finitioni fidei sub-  
scripti, ait Theod. in  
Conc. Chal. Act. 8.  
g Approbamus Sy-  
nodicas Epistolas  
Cyrilli Conc. Chal.  
Act. 5. in definit.  
h Nam continentur  
in Epist. Cyrilli et  
Conc. Alexand. ad  
Nestorium, quæ ex-  
tat inier Acta Con-  
cily Ephes. to. 1.  
Act. ca. 14. et repe-  
titur in Conc. 3.  
Coll. 6. p. 568. et  
seq.*

*¶ Act. 8.*

matize his writings: *There was*, saith he, *divers in the Councell of Chalcedon who said, that Theodoret had anathematized Cyrill, and was an heretike;* yet those holy Fathers most diligently examining this cause of *Theodoret, nihil aliud ab eo exigisse noscuntur, are known to have required no more of him, than that hee should anathematize Nestorius, and his impious doctrines; hoc sibi tantummodo suffi- re judicantes; judging this alone to be sufficient for them to receive* Theodoret. Now it is unfit, saith he further, *nos aliquid quære vetut omissum à patribus, that we should seek or require more than did the Councell of Chalcedon;* as if they had omitted any thing in this cause of *Theodoret*: seeing then they required no anathematizing of his writings against *Cyrill*, neither ought any others to anathematize, or require of any the anathematizing of the same.

12. As you saw *Vigilius* in the former Chapter to use *heretica astutia*, so may any man here easily discerne, that hee useth an evident, and fallacious sophistication. The Councell indeed required not that, nor did *Theodoret* in explicate, or expresse termes performe it, saying, I anathematize my owne writings against *Cyrill*, but in implicate termes, in effect, and by an evident consequent, both the Councell required, and *Theodoret* performed this before them all; for, *hee subscribed to the definition of faith decreed at Chalcedon*: one part of that definition is the approving of the Synodall Epistles of *Cyrill*: a part of one of those Epistles <sup>h</sup> are the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*, which *Theodoret* refuted: in every one of those chapters, is an anathema denounced to the defenders of the contrarie doctrine: Then certainly, *Theodoret* by subscribing to the definition, subscribed to the Epistles of *Cyrill*, by them to the twelve chapters, and by doing so he condemned, and anathematized all who oppugned those twelve chapters, and then undoubtedly, his owne writings which were published, as a confutation of those twelve chapters. And it seemes strange, that *Vigilius* professing that *Theodoret* did *devota mente suscipere*, with a devout affection receive and approve the Epistles of *Cyrill*, and the doctrine of them, could deny or be ignorant, that in doing so he did anathematize his owne writings, which by the twelve chapters of *Cyrill*, are anathematized.

13. Besides this, how often, how plainly doth the Councell of *Chalcedon* require, and urge *Theodoret* to anathematize *Nestorius* and his doctrines? how willingly did *Theodoret* performe this? What else is this, but a vertuall, and implicate anathematizing of those his owne writings against *Cyrill*, w<sup>ch</sup> defended *Nestorius* and his doctrines? None can anathematize the former, but *eo ipso* he doth most certainly (though not expressely) anathematize the later; as on the contrary, none can say (as *Vigilius* doth, and decreeth, that all shall doe the like) none can say that the writings of *Theodoret* against *Cyrill*, and his twelve chapters,



ters ought not to be anathematized, but *eo ipso*, even by saying so, he doth most certainly (though but *implicite* and by consequence) say that *Nestorius* and his heresie, ought not to be condemned. A truth so cleare that Pope *Pelagius* from his anathematizing of *Nestorius* and his doctrine, concludeth of *Theodoret*: *Constat eundem*, it is manifest, that in doing this, he condemned his owne writings against the twelve Chapters of *Cyrril*.

1. Pelag. 2. Epist. 7.  
5. Quod hoc.

14. Neither is that true which *Vigilius* fancied, that to require men to anathematize the writings of *Theodoret*, is to seeke, and require more then the Councell of *Chalcedon* required: It is not. It is but requiring the selfe same thing to be done in a suall and expresse termes, which the Councell required and *Theodoret* performed in vertuall and implicite termes. The thing required and done is the same: the manner onely of doing it, or requiring it to be done, is different: Even as to require of men to professe Christ to be *hominem*, which the Councell of *Nica*, and the Church ever since requireth, is not to require them to professe more, or ought else, then the Scripture teacheth, and all catholikes before professed by those words, *I and my Father are one*: but it is a requiring of an explicite profession of that truth concerning the unity of substance of the Father, and the Sonne, which by those words of Scripture they did before *implicite* professe.

1. Hoc testimonio  
omnes patres antea  
contra Arianos,  
ut probent unam esse  
essentiam patris et  
filij. Bell. lib. 1. de  
Christ. ca. 6. §.  
Quartum.

15. But yet at least will some of *Vigilius* friends reply, it was unfit to require this explicite anathematizing of *Theodoret*'s writings, seeing the Councell of *Chalcedon* did not require it. No, not so neither. The explicite condemning of them, was not onely fit, but necessarie at that time, in the dayes of *Iustinian*, and *Vigilius*: For as when the Arians denied Christ to bee *hominem*, it was enough for one to cleare himselfe of Arianisme, to say, that he held this text for true, *I and the Father are one*, though therein he doe *implicite* professe Christ to bee *hominem*, and though to have professed that alone, before the question about the unity of one substance was moved, had beene sufficient; but now he must *explicite* professe that truth which is *explicite* denied and oppugned: even so it is in this cause of *Theodoret*'s writings, and all like it. While there was no doubt moved by heretikes, whether those writings of his ought to be condemned; and whether by the Councell of *Chalcedon* they were condemned or no, so long it was sufficient for one to professe that he condemned *Nestorius*, and subscribed to the definition of *Chalcedon*: both which were *implicite* condemning of those writings of *Theodoret*: but when the Nestorians began to boast, that *Theodoret*'s writings against *Cyrril*, neither were condemned, but rather with the author of them approved by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, neither ought to be condemned, the Church now was necessarily enforced to require of all men a profession of that truth in plaine and explicite termes, which before they made onely in generall and *implicite*. Nor could *Vigilius*, or any other Nestorian, who refused in expresse manner to condemne the writings of *Theodoret*, purge him-

La. Sig. 1000  
et 1000. 1000  
1000. 1000. 1000  
1000. 1000. 1000

selfe of that heresie of *Nestorius* at this time, by saying they approved the definition of *Chalcedon*, or condemned *Nestorius*, though in both these they did *implicit*ly condemn the writings of *Theodoret*, but now they must expressly professe that which the heretikes expressly denied, they must in plaine termes anathematize those hereticall writings of *Theodoret*, and acknowledge them to have bin anathematized by the Council of *Chalcedon*, as the heretiks in plaine termes vaunted, that neither they ought nor were anathematized, but approved by the Council of *Chalcedon*, whensoever any point tending to the impeaching of faith begins *explicit*ly to be denied, the holy Church may not then content her selfe in generall and *implicit*ly to condemne the same, (few perhaps can perceive that; and many will make that generality of termes, as *Vigilius* and other Nestorians now did, but a cloak for their heresie) but the Church must now in most plaine, ease, and expressed manner that can be devised, both teach, declare, and define the same. This the Church did in this fifth Council, as in the other two, so in this Chapter touching *Theodoret's* writings. It taught but the very same which the Council of *Chalcedon* had done before it, anathematized those his writings, which at *Chalcedon* were anathematized before; but they did this now in a plaine manner and *explicit*ly, which by the Council of *Chalcedon* only in an obscure manner, and *implicit*ly was done before.

m Vig. Conf. nu.  
181.

16. The third personall error which *Vigilius* taketh for a ground of his decree, is that *Cyrill* himselfe though he was so exceedingly injured by the writings of those Easterne Bishops that rooke part with *Nestorius*, yet when he made union with them, he required them not to anathematize their owne writings, but overpast them in silence, as if there had never beene any such; whence *Vigilius* inferreth, that neither ought this anathematizing of their writings (by name of *Theodoret's*) bee required by others, yea he saith, the Fathers of *Chalcedon* imitated this example of *Cyrill*, and so would not require that of *Theodoret*, which they saw *Cyrill* not to have required of others.

17. The answer is easie by that which hath beene declared: this saying of *Vigilius* labourereth of the same equivocall sophistification, as did the former; for both *Cyrill* required, and all who were united unto him, and received into his, which was the communion of the Catholike Church, they all did, though not in *explicit* termes, which then was not needfull, yet veruall, and after a certaine, and undoubted, though *implicit*ly manner, condemn, and anathematize all their writings against *Cyrill*, and the Catholike faith; for he received none till they had anathematized the doctrines of *Nestorius*. This doth *Cyrill* himselfe most plainly witness in his Epistle to *Dynarus*, I would not, saith he, admit *Paulus* Bishop of *Emisa* into communion, *praequam Nestorij doctrinae proprio cyrogapho anathematizasset, until hee had anathematized by his owne hand writing the doctrines of Nestorius*. And he increased me in behalfe of the other Bishops, that I would  
rest

n Cyrill. Epist. ad  
Dynam. extat in  
Ala. Conc. Epist.  
10. 7. ca. 16.

rest contented with that profession which they had sent, and require no more: *nulla ratione id fieri passus, I would by no means yeeld unto that*, but I sent them a profession of faith, and when John 8. of Antioch, *et alique*, and the rest with him, had anathematized the doctrine of Nestorius, then and no before, *communione illi restitimus*, did we receive them into our communion. Thus Cyril, who by requiring this, did in effect require (so they performed the same) a condemning of all their writings which were made against him, and in defence of that heresie of Nestorius. And had Cyril lived to see any question made, whether those writings (by whomsoever they had beene written) ought to bee, or were by himselfe condemned, out of all doubt that holy Father would in most plaine, and expresse termes, have anathematized them all, as vertyually, and *implicite* he had before, and would most strictly have exacted the like expresse anathematizing of them, of all those who would wash their hands of the blasphemies, and heresies of Nestorius.

18. Now from these three grounds (every one of which is demonstrated to be untrue) *Vigilius* collects his Conclusion, nor definitive sentence in defence of this *second Chapter*, which also is an error, but not as the former, personal, but doctrinall; yea, hereticall: that those writings of *Theodoret*, or going under *Theodoret's* name against Cyril, and his twelve Chapters, ought not to be condemned; which is as much as if he had decreed plainly, that the heresies of Nestorius ought not to be condemned; for in those writings of *Theodoret*, they are all defended, and that with such eagernes, art, and acutenesse, that if all other Nestorian books were abolished, those writings alone of *Theodoret* would suffice as a rich storehouse to furnish the Nestorians with abundance of all kinde of weapons, to maintaine their owne, and oppugne the Catholike cause; nor ever can Nestorianisme bee puld downe, or overthrowne, so long as those writings of *Theodoret* keepe their credit, and stand uncondemned, yet shal not these be condemned, doth *Vigilius* decree.

19. Pope *Pelagius* seeing the poison of the hereticall doctrine, which the defending of this *second Chapter* doth beare with it, exclames against it in this manner: *O my deare brethren*, who seeth not these things to bee full of all impiety? And againe, who seeth not *quanta temeritate plenum sit Theodoretis scripta superbiendo defendere* how full of temeritie it is to defend so insolently, the writings of *Theodoret*? The first generall Councell, not onely accurseth those writings of *Theodoret*, as hereticall; but all who defend them, yea all who doe not anathematize them. A cleare evidence that they not onely judged this *second Chapter* to concerne the faith, but the Constitution of *Vigilius* even herein to be hereticall, because he would not anathematize those writings of *Theodoret*, and much more because he decreed that they should not be anathematized, and to their judgement consenteth the whole ca-

*o Pelag. 2. Epist. 7. §. Quia hac.*

*p Collat. 3. pa. 527.*



tholike Church, they all condemne the decree of *Vigilius* even in this point as hereticall.

q Quocumque scripta  
vel dogmata sceleratorum  
Nestorii & Eutychetis erroribus  
manifestantur confutari,  
anathematizantur & damna-  
mur. Vig. Const. nu.  
182.

20. I but *Vigilius* you will say condemneth those very heresies of *Nestorius*, which are defended in those writings; he doth so at least he seemes by his words to doe it: and had he not with all decreed that *Theodore's* writings should not bee condemned, he could not justly have beene reproved in this point. But in doing both, he proves not himselfe orthodoxal, by that well he saith well, but unconsistant and contrary to himselfe in overthrowing that which he saith well, for if *Theodore's* writings against *Cyril* may not be condemned, as *Vigilius* decreeth; then may not the doctrines of *Nestorius* defended therein be condemned as *Vigilius* would seeme to doe. *Theodore's* writings and Nestorianisme are inseparable companions, either both must stand, or both fall together. Its as impossible, and repugnant to condemne the one, and deny that the other may be condemned, as to condemne Euticheanisme, and yet defend the Ephesine larrocinie and decree thereof, for condemne Arianisme, and nor condemne the *Arimine* Councel. Its the honor of truth, that it never is nor can be dissonant to any other truth: but heresie not onely may, but almost ever doth fight, not only against truth, but against it selfe, & overthroweth with one hand, or positio, what it builds up by another, as in this of *Vigilius* is now apparent.

21. Now although this clearly convinceth the Popes decree to be hereticall, seeing it maintaineth two contradictory positions in a cause of faith, & the one is without all doubt an heresie; yet is it worthy the examining, whether of these contradictories must passe for the Popes judgment & cathedrall resolution in this cause. Cardinal *Baronius* will certainly direct vs in this doubt: for he tells us, (which of it selfe also is evident) that the Popes purpose & intent in setting forth this Constitution, was to defend the 3 Chapters adversus Imperatoris decretum, & sententiam Synodi, against the Emperours Edict, and the sentence of the fifth Synode. As the Emperour then and the Synode condemned, so was it the Popes maine purpose to defend the writings of *Theodore* against *Cyril*, which was the second Chapter. This is & must stand for the judgment & cathedrall resolution of the Pope in this matter: what he speaks repugnant to this is casual, & proter, nay contrainentionem, its against his mind & purpose, its to be thought onely by incogitancy to have slipped from his pen. So his condemning of the Nestorian doctrine is but in shew, its onely verball, his defining that *Theodore's* writings which maintain Nestorianisme may not be condemned, is the true purpose and intent of his mind, its cordial & real. By his verball condemning of Nestorianisme, he shuts it out in words, or as you may say at the foregate of his palace. By his defining that *Theodore's* writings may not be condemned, he pile in Nestorianisme with all his might, & sets wide open a postern gate unto it: by condemning Nestorianisme in

1 Pro ipsorum defensione laborat Vigilius. Bar. an. 553. nu. 172.  
Ibid. nu. 279.

shew

shew of words, he seemes to be orthodoxall, by defending Nestorianisme indeed and in truth, he demonstrates himselfe to be hereticall. Or because *Vigilius* was so very wise a Pope as hereafter out of *Basilius* you shall heare, it seemes he meane to shew the part of his wisdom, and policie, in this matter, and therefore while the heresie of *Nestorius* comes in his owne naturall habit, or in the liverie of *Nestorius*, away with it, the Pope himselfe will not admit it; hee cannot abide it, but when it comes countenanced, and graced, with the name of *Theodoret*, and in his liverie, the Pope embraceth it in both his armes, and by his Apostolicall authoritie commandeth all men to give most friendly welcome and entertainment unto it.

22 You have now the judgement, and ranked all resolution of *Vigilius*, touching this second Chapter, that the hereticall writings of *Theodoret* against *Cyril*, and the Catholike faith may not bee condemned. Take a view also of those two reasons, by which he labours to strengthen, and perswade the same. The former is drawne from the Councell at *Chalcedon*. It is, *scilicet* *Vigilius*, valde contrarius, & Chalcedonensis Synodi iudicio indubitaliter inimicus, vixit contrarie, and without all doubt repugnant to the judgement of the Synod at *Chalcedon*, that any Nestorian doctrine should now be condemned, sub eius facie dicitur nomine, under the name of Bishop *Theodoret*. So *Vigilius*.

23 Could he not content himselfe, to be hereticall alone, but lesse he disgraced the holy Councell of *Chalcedon* as guilty of the same heresie, as if they also had judged that none of *Theodoret's* writings, not those written against the faith, ought to bee condemned? They to judge this for is it contrary, and that indubitaliter, to condemne those writings of *Theodoret*, or any writings under his name? Far was it from the thoughts, much more from the grave judgement of so holy a Councell. Even themselves, as before we declared, condemned and anathematized all those writings of *Theodoret*, and warranted by their judgement all others to anathematize the same. *Gregorius* writes of the fifth Councell, that it is sequens in omnibus, in all things a follower of the Councell at *Chalcedon*. Seeing then the fifth Councell, doth so often and so constantly condemne and anathematize those writings of *Theodoret*, its undoubted, that the same writings were formerly condemned by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, the fifth Synod but treading in their steps and following them in that judgement, wherein they had gone before them. If so condemne those writings be repugnant to the judgement at *Chalcedon*, then is the fifth Councell not a follower but a confuter and contradicter of the judgement at *Chalcedon*. Not onely the fifth Councell, but the whole catholike Church ever since the time of *Vigilius*, they all doe reject, and condemne the judgement of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, seeing they all by approving the fifth Synod, and decree thereof, do anathematize

174. comp. 11.  
180.

u Lib. 7. Ind. 1.  
epist. 14.

these writings of *Theodoret*, which to doe is, as *Vigilius* teacheth, *indubitanter condemnatur*, most certainly contrary to the judgement of *Chalcedon*. If the whole catholike Church bee not hereticall (which to thinke is impietie) by contradicting and condemning the judgement of the Council at *Chalcedon*, then undoubtedly it is *Vigilius* hereticall in teaching, and decreeing, that to condemn any writings of *Theodoret*, or any under his name, is repugnant to the judgement of the Council at *Chalcedon*.

2. *Vigil. Conf. nu.*  
182.

24. The other reason of *Vigilius*, is, because it were a disgrace, injury and slander, against *Theodoret*, to condemn his writings. This the Pope expresseth in the very words of his sentence, in this manner, *The truth of these things* (those are the three personall points before handled) *being weighed, we ordaine and decree, nullo in injuriam, arguere obprobrium probatissimū viri, hoc est Theodoretū sub sanctorum venenatione, et quoniam fidei vel profectus, uti quicquid shall be done or spoken by any, so as he injury and slander of the most approved Bishop *Theodoret* by taxing of his name, and it must needs be taxed, if his writings or bookes be condemned.*

25. See here the compassionate and tender heart of *Vigilius*. Not only *Justinian*, and the fifth generall Council, but *Pelagius*, *Gregory*, and other succeeding Popes, and Councils, even the whole Catholike Church ever since the time of *Vigilius*, they all, by approving the decree of the fifth Synode, doe not onely take the name of *Theodoret*, but accuse, & anathematize the writings of *Theodoret*, and that even under his name. Now, such a loving and tender affection doth the Pope carry towards the hereticall writings of *Theodoret*, that rather, than they may be condemned, or his name taxed by the condemning of them, *Justinian*, *Pelagius*, *Gregory*, and other his successors, the fifth, the sixth, and other generall Councils, even the whole Catholike Church, they all must be, and are *de facto*, hereby declared, and by the Pope *anathematized* sentence decreed, and defined, not onely to bee hereticall, (as the former reason imported) but injurious persons, backbiters, & slanderers, they all must be condemned, and for ever disgraced, rather than *Theodoret*'s name must be taxed, or his hereticall writings condemned, or disgraced.

26. But say indeed: Is it an injury, a slander, a disgrace to one, that his errors should either by himselfe, or by the Church be condemned? How injurious was that holy Bishop Saint *Augustine* to himselfe in writing so many retractions, and corrections of what he saw amisse? And what himselfe did, hee would not onely willingly, but gladly have permitted the holy Church to have done. Nor may we thinke this mind to have been onely in *Augustine*, *Modestus* and *humiliter*, as the individuall commentators of true knowledge and learning: and the more learned any man is, the more judicious is he in espying the more ingenious in acknowledging the more lowly and humble, in condemning his owne errors. As it is but wind and no solid substance,







would not the writings of a man so noble for birth, and parentage, so famous for learning, so eminent in vertue, moys and perswade to assent unto him, if they might goe current with our taxing, without note or censure of the Church? and that much more than the bookes of *Origen*, both because *Origen* was but a Presbyter, but *Theodoret* a Bishop, and specially because *Origen* himselfe was by the Church condemned; and so the author being disgraced, the authority of his writings must needs be very small: but the person of *Theodoret* was approved by the whole Councell of *Chalcedon* they all proclaimed him a *Catholicke*, and orthodoxall Bishop. Here was a farre greater temptation, and greater danger when his writings are hereticall, whose person, so famous and holy a Councell commendeth for Catholicke. Now, or never was the Church to shew that it honoured no mans person, writings, or name, more thā the truth of Christ. And so much the rather was the Church to doe this in *Theodoret*, because about some thirty years, before this fift Councell, in the time of *Justinus* the Emperour, the Nestorians (as if not onely some writings of his, but *Theodoret* himselfe had beene wholly theirs) set up his image in a Chariot, and with great pompe, and singing of hymnes, brought it in triumphant manner into the City of *Cyrrus*, where *Sergius* a Nestorian, and Bishop of that place, mentioned in a Collect *Theodorus* of Mopsestia, Nestorian, and *Theodoret* as three of their principall Nestorian Saints: was it not now high time to wipe away that blemish from the name of *Theodoret*, and to condemne those writings of his which gave occasion to the Nestorians to make such boasts?

u *Origenem*, fontem  
Ary. Nicieni patres  
percussere, damna-  
tes enim eos qui fili-  
um negant esse de  
substantia patris, il-  
lum (*Origen* 2) Ari-  
umque damnav-  
runt. Hier. Epist.  
Pomac. de error.  
Orig. Omnis tam  
arientis, quam occi-  
dentis C. ibolicorum  
Synodus illum, he-  
reticum denunciat.  
Hier. Apol. 2. adver-  
Russ.  
x Con. Chal. 17. 8.  
y Nam Iustini re-  
scriptum de eo re-  
datum est Russico  
Coss. ut liquet ex  
Cone. 5. coll. 7. pa.  
182. Pbi rescriptum  
extat. Russicus vero  
Consul cum Vitalio  
no an. 520. Marcol.  
in Chron. et Bar. in  
eodem annu. no. x.  
u Conc. 5. coll. 7.  
pa. 182. et pa.  
178. d.

31. I appeale now unto any man, whether their condemning of *Theodoret*s writings, did not much more tend to the honour, then, as *Vigilius* fancieth, to the slander, and disgrace of his person. As it is a blemish to a man to retaine a filthy spot in his garment, but the taking of it away doth grace, and make him more comely, even so the name of *Theodoret* was stained by those writings; they emboldened the Nestorians to put him in their cursed Calender; but by the condemning of those writings was the stain and blemish wiped away from his person, his name, and honour was vindicated from the Nestorians, and brought, as it well deserved, to the holy Church of GOD; nothing of *Theodoret* left for heretikes to vaunt of, but the onely staines of *Theodoret*, nothing but those hereticall writings condemned and accursed, both by *Theodoret* himselfe, and by the whole Church of God.

32. No, no; it is Pope *Vigilius* (and such as applaud his decree for infallible) that disgraceth, and most ignominiously useth the name, person, and memory of *Theodoret*: By his decree those hereticall writings of *Theodoret*, which, by the Churches sentence of condemnation are quite dulled, receive full strength, and vigour for the Nestorians against Catholickes: By him the Nestorians have



have an eternall charter, and irrevocable decree, that *Theodoret's* writings against *Cyril*, and with them the heresie of *Nestorius*, ought not to be taxed, nor condemned. His *Apollitical* Constitution is a triumphant chariot for them to set the Image of *Theodoret* in their Temples, and with Anthemes and Collects to canonize, yea adore him in their Masses, among their heretical Saints. But for the Church of God, I constantly affirme they could not possibly have more honoured *Theodoret*, than by beating up the hay and stubble of his writings, the condemning of which the Pope decreeth to bee an injury and slander to him. May wee now in the last place consider a little what might be the intendment of *Vigilius* in pleading, and decreeing this for *Theodoret's* writings? I doubt not but the love he bare to Nestorianisme might make him zealous for those writings, which are the bulwarks of the Nestorians: but *non sum in eo* *ma*. Popes are men of profound thoughts, and very long reaches, they have deepe, and mysticall projects in their decrees. *Vigilius* had, and it may be principally, an eye to this his owne, and all their *Cathedral* Constitutions like unto it: If the heretical writings of *Theodoret* may not be condemned, because himselfe was a Catholike, *a fortiori*, this decree of *Vigilius*, be it never so hereticall, may not bee condemned, because the Pope is the head of all Catholikes. If it bee an injury, and a slandering of *Theodoret*, to taxe him, or his name, by condemning his writings, it must much more be an injury, and slander, nay, that is nothing, even a blasphemy and sinne irremissible to taxe the Popes Holinesse, by condemning his *Apollitical* decree: If you presume to condemne, nay, but taxe them, or their names, though their decrees shall bee as apparently hereticall, as are those writings of *Theodoret*, you are condemned for ever as injurious, as contumelious, as slandering persons. And let this suffice for the errors both personall, and doctrinall, of *Vigilius* touching this second Chapter.

And touching the third Chapter, which is of the condemnation of those writings, which are called *heretical*, and which are the writings of *Theodoret*, I have already said, that the condemnation of those writings, which are called *heretical*, and which are the writings of *Theodoret*, is a condemnation of those writings, which are called *heretical*, and which are the writings of *Theodoret*.

And touching the fourth Chapter, which is of the condemnation of those writings, which are called *heretical*, and which are the writings of *Theodoret*, I have already said, that the condemnation of those writings, which are called *heretical*, and which are the writings of *Theodoret*, is a condemnation of those writings, which are called *heretical*, and which are the writings of *Theodoret*.

That Vigilius and Baronius erre in divers personall points, & matters of fact, concerning the third Chapter, or the Epistle of Ibas.

**H**ere remaineth now the *third* & last *Chapter*,  
which concerns the impious *Epistle of the*, In  
handling whereof, being of them all most in-  
tricate, and obscure, as *Vigilius* first, and then  
long after him his *Champion Baronius*, have  
here bestowed greatest paines, and used all  
their subtilty, judging this to bee (as indeed  
by reason of the manifold obscurities, it is) the fittest cloake for  
their heresie; so must I on the other side intreate the more seri-  
ous and attentive consideration at the readers hands, while I  
indeavour, not onely to discover the darke and secret corners of  
this cause, but pull both the Pope and his Parasite out of this, be-  
ing their strongest hold, and most hidden hereticall den, where-  
in they hoped of all other most safely and securely to have lur-  
ked; for the more perspicuous proceeding wherein, before I  
come to the doctrinall errors, and maine heresie which in this  
*third Chapter* they maintaine; I will first manifest two or three  
of their personall untruths, which will both open a passage to  
the other, and will give the reader a taste, nay, a certaine expe-  
riment what truth, fidelity, and faire-dealing he is to expect at  
the hands of *Vigilius* and *Baronius* in their handling of this  
*Chapter*.

or 230 The first, and that indeed a capitall untruth, is, that *Vigili-*  
as avoucheth the Councell of <sup>a</sup> *Chalcedon* to have approved this  
*Epistle of Ibas* as orthodoxall. They approve that impious, and  
blasphemous Epistle? they rejected, they condemned, anathema-  
tizated, and accursed it to the very pit of hell, witnesse the fifth  
generall Councell, and the whole Catholike Church, which  
hath approved it; for thus cryed out, and proclaimed all the  
Bishops, *Epistolam b definitio sancti Chalcedonensis Concilij ruden-*  
*navit, eiecit; the definition of faith made by the holy Councell at Chal-*  
*cedon hath condemned this Epistle, is hath cast out this Epistle.*  
But because I have formerly <sup>c</sup> intreated heseof, I will adde no  
more of this which is proclaimed by the whole Church to be an  
untruth.

103. The second untruth is like this. *Vigilius* having cited the interloquutions of *Paschasius*, and *Maximus*, wherein they say that *Ibas* by his *Epistle* is declared to bee a Catholike, and therewith, that all the rest in the Councell of *Chalcedon* did not only not contradict their interloquutions, *verumetiam apertissimè et inconfusè praeiussisse consensum*; but also they are therewith to be assured, and

and that most manifestly unto those interloquutions. So *Vigilius*. It had beene enough, and too much to have said, that the Councell had assented, or had but seemed to assent: but *Vigilius* in saying that all the rest did most manifestly assent to those interloquutions, uttered a papall and supreme untruth, whereof no colourable pretence can be made, witnesse the fift general Councell, and the whole Catholike Church, which hath approved it: They expressly testifie, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* did *pro nulla habere, esseque in nihil*, that which was spoken by one or two, (those were *Paschasius*, and *Maximus*) for that Epistle, but of this also I have spoken before.

4. Now both these vnttruths, whereof *Vigilius* is so evidently, and by so ample witnesses convicted, Cardinall *Baronius* hath againe revived, telling with a face more hard than Brasse, or Adamant, *Patres dixerunt eam Epistolam ut Catholicam recipiendam*, the Fathers of *Chalcedon* said, that this Epistle of *Ibas* is to be received as orthodoxall: and againe, *ex ipsa Ibas fuisse probatum orthodoxum, aqua una fuit sententia omnium Episcoporum*, that *Ibas* was by this Epistle approved for a Catholike, it was the consent and uniforme judgement of all the Bishops at *Chalcedon*; then which, two lower untruths, and well worthy of a golden whetstone, could hardly have beene uttered: And though he tooke them from Pope *Vigilius*, yet are they farre more inexcusable in the Cardinall, than in the Pope his Master. *Vigilius* dyed before he saw the judgement of succeeding Popes, and generall Councils, which had he knowne, wee may charitably thinke, that his Holinesse would have cassied and defaced such palpable, and condemned untruths: But Cardinall *Baronius* knew all this; hee knew that the fift generall Councell had condemned these untruths in *Vigilius*: he knew that *Pelagius*, *Gregory*, and their successors, that the sixth, seventh, and other generall Councils had approved the fift Councell, and so in approving it, had condemned those same untruths, and yet against the knowne consent, and judgement of all those Popes, and generall Councils, that is, against the knowne testimonie of the whole Catholike Church for a thousand yeares together, he is bold to avouch both those former sayings, for truths, which all those former witnesses with one voyce proclaim, to be condemned untruths. Such account doth the Cardinall make of Fathers, Popes, Generall Councils, and of the whole Catholike Church, when they come crosse in his way.

5. A third personall matter there is concerning this Chapter, of which not *Vigilius*, but Cardinall *Baronius* doth enforce me to intreate, and that is, whether *Ibas* was indeed the author of this Epistle, or no: for although it be not materiall to the intent of the fift Councell, (which, against the decree of *Vigilius*, we now defend) whether *Ibas* writ it or not, seeing neither this fift, nor the former Councell of *Chalcedon* condemned the author of this Epistle, but onely the Epistle it selfe, yet seeing the

Cardinall

e Conc. 5. Coll. 6.  
pa. 576. a. b.

f Bar. an. 553. nu.  
191.

g Ba an. 448. nu. 71

h In 6. collatione  
Conc. 5. allata ab  
ipso *Vigilio* pro de-  
fensione Ibae Episto-  
lae consulantur.  
Bar. an. 553. nu.  
210.  
i *Gregorius* cum  
praedecessoribus et  
successoribus ejus  
omnes quinque Sy-  
nodum confirmasse  
testantur. Bar. an.  
553 nu. 229.  
k Bar. ibid.



Cardinall was pleased to undertake the defence of a needlesse untruth, that this is not the Epistle of Ibas. I am desirous that all should see how wisely and worthily hee hath behaved himselfe in this point.

6. Baroni<sup>us</sup> speaking against this Epistle, first makes it doubtfull whose it is, saying <sup>1</sup>, *author qui fertur nomine Iba, quisquis ille fuerit, the author of this Epistle which passeth under the name of Ibas, whatsoever he be;* and having thus bred a distrust in your mindes: then as the serpent dealt with Eve, hee positively sets downe his untruth. It is not the Epistle of Ibas, in this manner: *Caterum, ut publica acta testantur, producta in Concilium Epistola illa, non esse Iba comperta, but the publike acts doe testifie, that when this Epistle was produced in the Councell at Chalcedon, it was found not to be the Epistle of Ibas:* and so it being condemned, Ibas was absolved. Thus Baroni<sup>us</sup>, who for prooffe hereof alleageth the publike acts <sup>a</sup> both of the Councell of Chalcedon, and of the 2. Nicene Synod. And truly in the second Nicene Synod, that which the Cardinall saith, is read indeed by Epiphani<sup>us</sup>, a Deacon in that Synod: but it is the testimony of the whole Countell, Epiphani<sup>us</sup> onely reading and proposing it in the name <sup>o</sup> and behalfe of the Synod. And because it is a testimony very pregnant for the Cardinalls assertion, and is cited out of a Councell which he much honoreth, & affecteth, I will do him the favour, as at large to expresse that passage: the rather because this, as the whole answer read by Epiphani<sup>us</sup>, is not onely commended as a matter delivered <sup>p</sup> unto them by the holy Ghost: but they further request <sup>q</sup> all who shall happen to light on that commentarie of theirs, that they will not read it slightly, or perfunctorily, but with singular indagation and search of the same. And I am loth to deny those Nicene Fathers, so very just and reasonable a request.

7. In that place there was read on the behalfe of the Iconoclasts, a testimonie out of the ancient Father Epiphani<sup>us</sup> Bishop of Cyprus, forbidding to set up Images either in the Churches, or in Churchyards, or in their common dwelling houses, but every where to carie about, God in their hearts. This saying nettled the Nicene Fathers not a little; who were very superstitiously devoted to Image-worship: and therefore instead of a better answer, they say that the booke whence that is alleaged, is falsly ascribed to Epiphani<sup>us</sup>, hee was not the author of it. Epiphani<sup>us</sup> they honor <sup>a</sup> as an holy Father and Doctor of the Catholike Church, but that booke going under his name, they reject: which fact of theirs, they illustrate and labour to warrant by the example of the Councell at Chalcedon, who received Ibas himselfe, but accursed the Epistle going under the name of Ibas; *non enim demonstrari poterat quod esset Iba: for it could not be proved to be the Epistle of Ibas:* wherefore they anathematized not Ibas, but it: *Dicebatur enim Iba, cum tamen illius handquaquam esset: for it was said to be the Epistle of Ibas; whereas indeed it was none of his.* Even

1 Bar. an. 432. nu. 71.

in Ibid.

in Conc. Chalc. Act. 10. & Conc. Nic. 2. Act. 6. citantur à Bar. in idem.

o Epiphanius scitum à patribus appositam responsionem perlegit. Bar. nu. 787. nu. 34.

p Quam consulationem nobis spiritus sanctus dedit. Conc. N. 2. Act. 6. pa. 356. a.

q Rogamus autem, quicunque, etc. ibid. b.

r Conc. Nic. 2. Act. 6. pa. 371. a.

1 Epiphanius Cyprianus sic inquit, Ne in ecclesiam imagines inferatis, neque in cimiterijs statuas, neque in domo communi tolerentur. ibid.

r Id (ex Epiphanius lectum) nequaquam illius existit. ibid. a. Et, verum ut novitij (libelli) et alieni falsiq; sunt. ibid. b.

u Commentarium illum reijcimus beatum autem patrem (Epiph.) ecclesia Doctorem agnoscimus. ibid. b. x Ibid. b.

so those false writings against venerable Images are said to bee the writings of Bishop *Epiphanius*, but they are not his. So those publike acts, and second Nicene Fathers, whose testimony concurrerth and jumpeth with the Cardinall, this is not the Epistle of *Ibas*.

8. Before I come to examine those publike acts, I must ob-  
serve one thing touching *Baronius*, which he will occasion and in-  
force me often to repeat; and this it is, that *Baronius* was meerly  
infatuated in his handling of this whole cause touching the *three*  
*Chapters*, and this one might almost even sweare: but any may  
see it as cleare as the light: besides many other, even by this one  
point whereof we now intreat. If a man should study and devise  
ten dayes together, how to confute and utterly overthrow all  
that Pope *Vigilius* hath decreed touching this *third Chapter*; and  
all which *Baronius* himselfe hath either taught or said in defence  
of *Vigilius* in that point, he cannot possibly doe it more clearly,  
more certainly, more effectually, then by denying, as the Cardi-  
nall, and his Nicene Fathers doe, that this is the Epistle of *Ibas*:  
for how could either the Councell of *Chalcedon*, or the Popes  
Legates therein, by this Epistle, and by the dictation and con-  
tents thereof judge *Ibas* to be a Catholike (which *Vigilius* de-  
creeth, and *Baronius* more then twenty times I thinke repeat-  
eth,) unlesse it were indeed the Epistle of *Ibas*; for of *Ibas* no  
otherwise then in the first person, or as the author and writer of  
it, there is no mention at all to be found or collected out of that  
Epistle.

9. Now if you require testimonies, or authorities in this  
case, I oppose to *Baronius* the Popes Legates at *Chalcedon*, of  
which *Baronius* himselfe saith<sup>a</sup>; *This to be the Epistle of Ibas, the*  
*Popes Legates, and after them the rest of the Bishops by their subscrip-*  
*tion, confirmed; and againe, the*<sup>b</sup> *Acts of Chalcedon doe teach, that*  
*this we acknowledged to be the Epistle of Ibas.* I oppose Pope  
*Vigilius*, who in his *Constitution* assenteth<sup>c</sup> to that judgement of  
the Popes Legates, and those words, *relecta ejus Epistola, the E-*  
*pistle of Ibas being read, we acknowledge him to be a Catholike.*  
I oppose the confession of *Ibas* himselfe, of which *Baronius* saith,  
the<sup>d</sup> *Acts at Chalcedon declare Ibas confessum esse eam esse suam,*  
*that Ibas confessed this Epistle to be his owne:* and againe<sup>e</sup>, we have  
before declared *Ibas eandem Epistolam suam esse professum, that*  
*Ibas professed this same Epistle to be his owne:* and *Ibas* of all men in  
the world knew best, whether it was his or no. I oppose lastly  
*Baronius* to *Baronius*, for he<sup>f</sup> saith of this Epistle, *verè esse Iba fa-*  
*isse cognitam, that it was knowne truly and indeed to be the Epistle of*  
*Ibas.* Say now in sadnesse, what you thinke of *Baronius*, and  
where you thinke his five wits were, when hee denied, and that  
upon prooffe by publike records, this to be the Epistle of *Ibas*,  
which the Popes Legates, with the whole Councell of *Chalcedon*,  
which Pope *Vigilius* whom hee defendeth, which *Ibas* his owne  
selfe,

<sup>y</sup> *Vigil. Const.*

nu. 196.

<sup>z</sup> *Bar. an. 553. nu.*

191, 192, 193, 196

197, &c.

<sup>a</sup> *Bar. an. 448.*

nu. 71.

<sup>b</sup> *an. eod. nu. 77.*

<sup>c</sup> *Vigil. Const. nu. 90*

<sup>d</sup> *Bar. an. 448. nu.*

77.

<sup>e</sup> *Bar. an. 553.*

nu. 211.

<sup>f</sup> *an. 448. nu. 71.*

selfe, yea which *Baronius* also acknowledgeth, confesseth, and professeth to be truly, and in very deed the Epistle of *Ibas*.

10. But what shall we then say to those publike acts, which as the Cardinall tells us, doe testifie, that this is not the Epistle of *Ibas*. What first to the acts of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, which be first alleageth, and the tenth Action thereof? I say, and say it upon certaine grounds, that the Cardinall therein saith an untruth, for prooffe whereof, I appeale to that same tenth Action of the Councell, in no part whereof it is said, nor can thence be collected, that this was not the Epistle of *Ibas*. Or if you will not believe my saying, yet beleve the Cardinall himselfe, more then once testifying that which he saith to be untrue. These are his words <sup>h</sup>, *The Acts of the tenth Action of the Councell at Chalcedon: Eandem epistolam ut Iba cognitam esse a patribus docent, doe teach, that this Epistle was knowne to be the Epistle of Ibas*. And againe, *Vere esse Iba fuisse cognitam eandem actio decima docet, that this was knowne to have beene truly the Epistle of Ibas, the tenth action of the Councell at Chalcedon doth teach*. Thinke you not that *Baronius* is more like the *Episcopall Satyr*, then a grave Cardinall of the *Romane Church*? At his first blast he makes the tenth action of the Councell at *Chalcedon* to testifie that this is not the Epistle of *Ibas*; and then hee blowes a quite contrary blast, professing the tenth action of the Councell at *Chalcedon* to testifie that this is truly, and certainly the Epistle of *Ibas*.

11. O, but the second *Nicene Councell*, and the publike acts thereof, they witness the same which the Cardinall affirmeth, that this is not the Epistle of *Ibas*. They doe so indeed: But as it is an untruth in the Cardinalls mouth: so it is also in those his *Nicene Fathers* from whom hee tooke it, unlesse perhaps those men of *Nice*, knew better whose Epistle it was, then did the 600 holy Bishops of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, before whom *Ibas* stood, or better then *Ibas* himselfe who confessed it to bee his owne Epistle. The Cardinall may not be offended that we dissent from his *Nicene Councell*, which dissenteth from the holy Councell at *Chalcedon*, from *Ibas* his owne confession, yea from whom the Cardinall dissenteth as much as we in this point. And I cannot see, what depth of wisdom it was in his Cardinallship to alleage them for witnesses, whose testimony himselfe in this very point for which he produceth them, doth avouch to bee untrue. But let him please himselfe in those *Nice Fathers*, we envie not such a Councell, nor such Fathers, nor such publike records unto them. That *Nicene assembly* was but a conspiracie against the truth, it was fit they should uphold untruth, by untruth. And whosoever shal be pleased to examine and rip up the Acts of that Councell, I will give him this one assured comfort, that besides their superstitious & heretical doctrines therein maintained, he shall finde them full stuf with many grosse and palpable untruths, of matters *de facto*, on which they build their doctri-

g Bar. an. 432.

an. 71.

h Bar. an. 448.

an. 77.

i Ibid. an. 71.



all positions, as in this concerning the Epistle of *Ibas*, it is now most manifest.

12. For this time I will not enter into so spacious a field, but yet this one thing by the way I cannot but observe; seeing those Nicene Fathers professe, that writing against Image-worship, going under the name of *Epiphanius*, to be in such sort the book of *Epiphanius*, as this Epistle going under the name of *Ibas*, is the Epistle of *Ibas*: and seeing we have now demonstrated this Epistle to be truly and indeed the Epistle of *Ibas*, it followeth even by their owne reason and comparifon, that the book also against Image-worship, cited by the Councell at *Constantinople* in the name of *Epiphanius*, is in truth and in very deed the true writing of Bishop *Epiphanius*. And yet further, because those Nicene Fathers acknowledged *Epiphanius* for a Catholike <sup>2</sup> Doctor of the Church, one who held the ancient tradition <sup>1</sup> of the Church, and consented to the Catholikes, in and before his time: it hence againe followeth, that the doctrine of condemning Image-worship which in that booke of *Epiphanius* is delivered, & was by the generall Councell at *Constantinople* some thirty <sup>m</sup> yeares before this Nicene Assembly, decreed <sup>2</sup>, that it I say is ancient, Catholike, consonant to the ancient tradition, and the doctrine of the ancient and catholike Fathers of the Church, even from the Apostles time. And this is all which *Baronius* hath gained by his alleaging those publike acts of the Nicene Fathers, to prove this not to be the Epistle of *Ibas*. And let this suffice to be spoken of the personall untruths of *Vigilius* and *Baronius* touching this Epistle of *Ibas*, which are but a *proludium* to their doctrinall errors and heresies; wherof in the next place we are to entreat.

k Beatum patrem  
(Epiphanius) ca-  
tholica ecclesia  
Doctorem agnosci-  
mus. Conc. Nic. 2.  
Act. 6. pa. 371. b.  
Illi qui antiquam  
ecclesie traditionem  
recipiunt beatus E-  
piphanius non ad-  
versarius. Ibid. b.  
in Conc. Const. con-  
tra Imagines, habi-  
tum est an. 754.  
Bin. 16. 3. pa. 229.  
Conc. Nicenum ha-  
bitum an. 787.  
Bin. notis in id  
Conc.  
n Qui imaginem  
ausus fuit parare,  
aut adorare, aut in  
ecclesia, aut in pri-  
vata domo constitu-  
ere, aut clam habe-  
re, si Episcopus fuerit,  
deponatur. Dec. De-  
cretum Conc. Con-  
stant. sub Constan-  
tino Copronimo,  
quod extat in Nice-  
no Conc. 2. Act. 6.  
pa. 377. d.

## CHAP. XI.

That *Vigilius* and *Baronius* in their former reason for defence of the Epistle of *Ibas*, drawn from the union with *Cyrill*, mentioned in the latter part of that Epistle, doe defend all the heresies of the *Nestorians*.

1.



EE come now from personall matters to that which is the Capital point, and maine heresie contained in the defence of this *this* Chapter, wherein *Vigilius*, and *Baronius* have so behaved themselves, that those former errors though they be too shamefull, are but a very sport and play to that hereticall frenzie which here they doe expresse. For now you shall behold the Pope and his Cardinall in their lively colours, fighting under the banner of *Nestorius*, and using the most cunning stratagems that were ever devised, to cloake their hereticall doctrine, and gaine credit to that condemned

demned heretic. Those sleights are principally two. The former is gathered out of the latter part of the *Epistle of Ibas*, where mention is made of the union betwixt Cyrill, and John, which although I touched before, yet because it is a matter of greater obscurity, and containeth a most notable fraud of *Agellius*, and *Baronius*, I purposely reserved the full handling of it unto this place, where without interruption of other matters, I might have scope enough to explain the depth of this mystery. In the time of the Ephesine Councell, there was, as all know, an exceeding breach betwixt Cyrill, with other Catholike Bishops, who condemned *Nestorius*, and John Bishop of Antioch, with divers other Eastern Bishops, who tooke part with *Nestorius*, against the holy Councell. And the division was so great, that at the selfe same time, in one, & the selfe same citie of Ephesus, they held two severall Councells, and set up *altare contra altare*, Councell against Councell, Patriarke against Patriarke, Bishops against Bishops, and Synodall sentence against Synodall sentence. But betwixt those two Councells, there was as much difference, as is betwixt light and darkenesse, betwixt truth and heresie, betwixt the Church of God, and the Synagogue of Satan. The one consisted of holy orthodoxall and Catholike Bishops whose President was Cyrill: the other of hereticall, factious, and divers deposed Bishops, whose President was John. The former condemned *Nestorius* & his blasphemous doctrine, whereby hee denied Christ to be God: the latter defended *Nestorius* and all his impious doctrines. The former was held in a Church, even in the Church of the Blessed *Virgin*, whose Sonne they professed to be truly God: the latter in an inne, or Taverne, a fit place for them who denied Christ to be God. The former proceeded in all respects, orderly and Synodally, as was fit and requisite that they should: the latter did all things tumultuously, presumptuously, and against the Canons of the Church, supporting themselves onely by lies, calumnies, and slanderous reports. In a word, the former was truly an holy, a generall, an Oecumenicall Councell, wherein was the consens of the whole Catholike Church: the latter was nothing else, but an hereticall, schismaticall, and rebellious faction or conspiracie of some thirtie or fortie persons, unworthily the name of Bishops, insolently opposing themselves to the holy Councell, yea to the whole Catholike Church, in which number and faction besides others, who less concerne our purpose, were

a Sup. 224.

*o* Iohannes cum suis, nullam omnino vel per leges ecclesiasticas, vel per Augustinum decretum, potestatem obtinuit, libel. Cyrill. et Mem. ablatius f. synodo. 2. Actus. 1. Iohannes cum ecclesiastica autoritate procurata, omnis ecclesie, forum ardeat & rursus & consuetudine concepta, &c. ibid. Que tenent vana fana & infusa, queque preter omnem Canonum ordinem ediderant, &c. Epist. Synod. ad Imp. to. 4. ca. 8. quod contra leges et canones omnemq. ordinem pertraxerunt, ibid. Et Omnes Orientales et Occidentales vel per se vel per legatos sacerdotes hunc concessum interfuerunt. Ad. Epist. to. 2. ca. 16. Quod a vobis exiit iudicium, aliud mihi esse quam omnium concordantem terrarum ordinem sententiamque consensum. Epist. Synod. Epist. Conc. ad Imp. to. 2. ca. 17. Et ille (Iohannes) 30. tantum numerum, et que vel heretici vel alii illius factionis socii, Epist. Synod. 3. Conc. ad Imp. to. 4. ca. 2. Iohannes rebellionis huius antegegnus. ibid. ca. 3. & alibi supra.

h Vi pater ex eorum  
subscriptum. *At.*  
*Conc. Ephes. 10. 3. ca.*  
*2. & 10m. 4. ca. 7.*

i *Glic. Annal. part.*  
*4. pa. 365.*

k Post duos dies ve-  
nimus in Ephesum  
ait Ibasio Epist. sua.  
*Conc. Chal. act. 10.*  
signatum sum pri-  
matem meum ibid.  
*pa. 112. b.*

l Tu Cyrille & tu  
Memnon, scitote  
vos excommunicatos,  
omnique episcopali  
honore exutos. *10. 3.*  
*At. Eph. ca. 2.*

m Capita heretica  
de Cyrillo exposita ut  
que Evangelica &  
Apostolica doctrina  
aperit repugnant. *1.*  
*ibid.*

n *At. Conc. Ephes.*  
*10. 4. ca. 7.*

o At vos reliqui om-  
nes qui Cyrilli actis  
consensistis, anathe-  
matizati subsecundum  
*3. Ephes. act. 10. ca.*

p Schismaticorum  
bonitas invidiam. *10. 4.*  
*At. Conc. Ephes. ca.*  
*13.*

q Sacra Synodus,  
et ceteri, *act. ca.*  
*2. & 7. & 10. & 11. & 12.*

r Consilio illorum  
consistendo se con-  
juncturum. *10. 3.*  
*At. Ephes. ca. 1.*

s Quodam inter se  
conciliabulum in-  
stituerunt. *ibid. ca. 4.*

t Seditiose, indeque  
contra ecclesiasticas  
sanctiones, regulas  
decreta consensistis.  
*ibid. ca. 2.*

u Qui furis qui-  
busdam agitatis, A-  
rion, Apollinarique  
dogmata instaura-  
re voluerunt. *10. 3.*  
*ca. 10.*

v Scilicet Cyrilla-  
nos tyrannide frau-  
ditibus & c. *append.*  
*ad 10. 3. At. Ephes.*  
*ca. 10.*

x To. 4. *act. ca. 15.*  
*et ca. 18.*

y In proximis, sapientis  
pauca sunt. *act. ca. 15.*  
*et ca. 18.*

z Parati sumus primi  
viri, quam suscipere  
animum ex Cyrilli  
epistola. *ib. ca. 7.*

these <sup>h</sup> John Bishop of Antioch, the ring-leader of the rest, Paulus Bishop of Emisa, Theodoret of whom we before entreated, and Ibas, (not then, but some three or four years after Bishop of Edessa) whom to have been present at that time as a Bishop, though his name be not expressed in their subscription, both <sup>i</sup> Glic in his Annales, and the Council at Chalcedon, <sup>k</sup> and then his owne words therein, doe make manifest.

3. Now though there was so great odds betwixt the holy Council, and this factious conventicle, yet were they (as is the custome of all heretickes and schismatickes) most insolent in all their actions. As the holy Council deposed Nestorius for an heretick, so the Conventicle to ery quittance with them, deposed <sup>l</sup> Cyrill for an Arch-heretick also, condemning <sup>m</sup> his twelve Chapters as hereticall, which the holy Council had approved as orthodoxall. As the holy Council excommunicated <sup>n</sup> and anathematized, John, Paulus, Theodoret, Ibas, and all the rest of their factious adherents, and defenders of Nestorius, and his heresie: So did the Conventicle also excommunicate and anathematize Cyrill, and all <sup>o</sup> that tooke part with him, and defended his twelve Chapters, and so among these, even Pope Celestine, and the whole Catholike Church. As the holy Council truly and justly, called themselves, the sacred and oecumenicall Council, and tearmed John with his adherents, a faction and hereticall Conventicle of Nestorians: so did the Conventicle arrogate unto themselves, the glorious name of the holy <sup>p</sup> Ephesine Council, and slandered them which held with Cyrill to be a Conventicle, an unlawfull <sup>q</sup> and disorderly assembly, tearming them Arions, <sup>r</sup> Apollinarians, and from Cyrill, Cyrillians <sup>s</sup>. As the holy Council constantly refused, to communicate with John <sup>t</sup>, or any of his faction, nor ill they did consent to the deposing of Nestorius, and anathematizing his heresie: so the conventicle most peevishly and pertinaciously not onely refused the communion with Cyrill, and other Catholikes, but bound themselves by many solemne oathes, <sup>u</sup> and that even in the presence of the Emperor, that they would never communicate with the Cyrillians, unless they would condemne the twelve chapters of Cyrill, adding that they would rather dye <sup>v</sup>, then admit or consent unto any one of those twelve chapters. Such an unhappie and lamentable breach John and the Eastern Bishops made in the Church at the time of that Ephesine Council.

4. The religious Emperours Theodosius, and Valentinian whose imperiall authority, was the onely meane to end all these strifes, had they beene personally present in the Synod, to see all these disorders, they would no doubt, either have prevented this breach, or after it had hapned, have healed and made

<sup>y</sup> In proximis, sapientis pauca sunt. *act. ca. 15. et ca. 18.* <sup>z</sup> Parati sumus primi viri, quam suscipere animum ex Cyrilli epistola. *ib. ca. 7.*



up the same. But they residing then at *Constantinople*, were extremely abused by the vile dealings of the Nestorians, for so much had these Nestorians prevailed, both at the Court and in the Citie of *Constantinople*, where *Nestorius* had bene Bishop, that though the holy Councell sent letters after letters, to certifie the truth of all matters to the Emperors, yet either word their messengers stop, or their letters by the malicious vigilancie of the Nestorians intercepted; so that none, no nor any small notice of them came to the Emperors, whereas on the other part the frequent letters of the conventicle fraught with lies & slanders, had every day access, yea applause in the Citie, in the Court, and before the Emperors. And which was the worst of all, Count *Candidianus*, whom the Emperours made their owne deputie, and president of the Councell, to see all good, and Synodall orders observed therein; hee failed of that trust committed unto him, and being most partiall towards *Nestorius* and his heresie, by his letters also he seconded and soothed all the lies which the conventicle had writ unto the Emperors. By which meanes it came to passe, that the Emperors knowing nothing of that division amongst the Bishops; & how beside the holy Councell, there was a factious and schismaticall conventicle held in the citie, thought all that was done, as well against *Cyrill*, and *Memnon*, in deposing them, as against *Nestorius*, in deposing him, that all this had bene in the Act, judgement and sentence of one and the same Councell, upon which subreption and misinformation, the Emperors confirmed at the first the condemnation of them all three. But at length a letter being brought from the holy Synod to *Constantinople* by one, who to avoid suspicion put on the habit of a begger; and carried the letter in the trunk of his hollow staffe which for that purpose he had provided; as soone as the report of these strange disorders came to the Emperors eares, they sent for, and commanded certaine Bishops of either side, personally to come before them to *Constantinople*, that they might bee fully informed of the truth in all the proceedings: and the truth after diligent examination being found, the Emperors by their Imperiall authoritie adnulled all the Acts of the conventicle, restored *Cyrill*, and *Memnon*, approved the judgement of the holy Councell against *Nestorius*, adding banishment also from *Constantinople*, to his deposition: But the Synodall sentence of deposition against *John*, and the other Bishops of his faction, that they staied, and suspended for a while, partly to prevent a greater schisme, which *John* was like to procure, but specially in hope that *John*, and the other Easterne Bishops might in time be

a Arbitramur piff.  
Imperatorem nihil  
horum dilucide in-  
tellexisse. Ita terra  
maris obfidemur, ut  
nihil eorum que vo-  
bis hic evenit ve-  
stra Sanctitudini  
significari possit  
quoniam Episcopus Jan. com-  
ad Episcopum Jan. a  
liis. tom. 4. act. ca.  
21. Quod Nestorius  
falsos iuravit, con-  
tra omnes de publi-  
cas vias, obsequio,  
memoria, quibus a  
sacra Synodo Con-  
stantinopol. unive-  
rsis promissum est, ad  
Episcop. ca. 19.

b Et interim que  
finitis Christi e-  
rant, ut videretur  
inferrebant. Ibid.  
c Candidianus Co-  
mes amicum Nes-  
torii potius antequam  
ea quae  
vestra instigare flu-  
dit, qua cum sit  
tam Nestoria com-  
pota, etiam in  
ta instigabat. Ca-  
listo Synod. ad imp.  
ca. 4. et 10.

d Et Nestorius, &  
Cyrillus, et Memnon,  
non excommunicationem  
a Sanctitate vestra  
aut in finitum,  
sed nostro appro-  
bationem. Sicut  
iussu ad Augustum  
ad Synod. 10. 3. act.  
Episcop. ca. 15.

e Episcopus ex  
Episcop. scripto. Episcopus  
cujusdam personae,  
qui in Scipione tam  
inclusam gerbat,  
tandem reddita est.  
tom. 2. act. ca. 19.

f Placuit pientiss. Regi ut Egyptum et Armeniam in suis locis manerent. Episc. Legationum Concilior. Append. tom. 3. ca. 10. pa. 791. d. et ille (Cyrillus) ad almonem suum rediit. Ibid. 11. g Legationum Synodi sententia publicè approbata, Orientales quidam condemnant, Nestorius vero excommunicant. Episcopus Jan. tom. 5. act. Episcop. ca. 11. h Quae extat tom. 4. act. ca. 7. i Imperator decrevit ut sententia excommunicata Synodi contra Nestorium vim obtineret, quod in causa illius confirmasset. Legationum. Ibid. tom. 6. Episcop. 3. Perum. pa. 937.

reduced and brought to unitie with *Cyrril*, and the catholike Church, which in that height of their heat and stomacke could nor have beene expected. And thus was the Councell at *Ephesus* dissolved; a farre greater rent by this means being left at the end, then had beene at the beginning thereof, and so that maladie for which it was called, not cured but increased.

But the religious Emperor *Theodosius* could not bee at quiet while the Church was thus disturbed, but the very next year after the *Ephesine* Councell was ended, when time and better advise had now cooled the former heat of the *Eastern* Bishops, hee began to effect that union which before he had intended, and he so earnestly laboured therein, that himselfe professed, *I am certainly and firmly resolved, not to desist in working this reconciliation, untill God shall vouchsafe to restore unitie and peace to the Church.* To which purpose hee writ a very religious, and effectuall Epistle to *Iohn B. of Antioch*, by many reasons perswading, and by his imperiall authoritie commanding him, and with him the rest of the faction, to subscribe to the deposition of *Nestorius*, & the anathematizing of his heresie, and so to embrace the holy communion with *Cyrril*, and the catholike Church, which perswasions of the Emperor, tooke indeed the intended effect: for after some tergiversation for a while, both *Iohn* and most of the *Eastern* Bishops, before the end of that yeare, relented, and in a Synod held at *Antioch*, subscribed as the Emperor perswaded them, both to the deposing of *Nestorius*, and to a truly orthodoxall profession, sent unto them by *Cyrril*, wherein they approved the holy *Ephesine* Councell, and condemned all the heresies of *Nestorius*; and upon this their consenting to *Cyrril*, and the orthodoxall faith, were received into the peace of the Church, and so union and concord, was fullie concluded betwixt *Cyrril*, with the other orthodoxall Bishops, & *Iohn* with most of those *Eastern* Bishops, who before adhered unto him.

Let us now see how *Agidius*, and after him *Baronius* under colour of this *Epistle*, plead for *Ibas*, & his heretical Epistle. In the end of that Epistle, *Ibas* makes mention, of the union betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrril*; yea mentioneth it as a great blessing of God to the Church, seeing that he not onely consented, but greatly rejoiced at the same. Thus much is cleare and certaine by the Epistle. Now because the Union as we have declared, was made by consenting to the Catholike faith, it seemes that *Ibas* who consented to the Union, consented also to the Catholike faith, and so was received into the communion of *Cyrril* and the Catholike Church. Seeing then *Ibas* by this Epistle is shewed to approve and embrace the Union, and embracing of the union is the prooffe of a Catholike, it followeth that even by this Epistle *Ibas* declares himselfe to be a very good Catholike, and an earnest embracer of the Catholike faith. This is the summe of their collection, which is as any will confesse, a very faire & plausible pretence, and therefore more fit for the Pope and Cardi-

shall to cloake their heresie under the shew thereof. But least we seeme either to wrong them, or leave out ought which is emphaticall in their reason, it is needfull to heare them dispute in their owne words.

7. It differeth much, saith <sup>q Bar. ad. 443. nu.</sup> *Baronius*, to say that the Epistle is <sup>75.</sup> Catholike, or that those things which are written in it are true, and to say that *Ibas* by this Epistle was proved to be a catholike. *Etenim nihil aliud inde acceperunt patres nisi Ibas tunc temporis fuisse Catholicum*, for the fathers at Chalcedon tooke nothing at all out of that Epistle, but that *Ibas* at that time (when he writ it) was a Catholike, seeing in it is demonstrated that *Ibas* who had sometimes erred with the Nestorians, and delt against *Cyrill*, after the peace once made, did communicate with *Cyrill*, and condemne *Nestorius* with his doctrine. Againe, the reader is here to be admonished; that the sentence of the fathers at Chalcedon doth not tend to this end, <sup>Bar. an. 553. nu. 191.</sup> *ut voluerint probasse Epistolam Iba*, as if they meant to approve the Epistle of *Ibas*; in which there are many blasphemies affirmed, neither did *Vigilius* meane to reach this: *sed tantum ex ea recipiendum esse Ibas*, *in qua nimirum testetur ipse se jam amplecti pacem ecclesia, qua recepta, necesse fuerit eundem probare Catholicum*, but both they and *Vigilius* meant only that *Ibas*, by this Epistle was to be esteemed and embraced as a Catholike, seeing in this Epistle *Ibas* testifieth that he embraced the peace of the Church, which being received, it is necessary that he be approved for a catholike. Againe, the Fathers of Chalcedon, said, <sup>cynd.</sup> *that this Epistle was to be received as Catholike*, not in regard of those errors wherewith *Ibas* was once intangled, and which are recited therein, *sed quod ex illa Ibas profiteretur se paci iniuncta consentire*; but for that *Ibas* in it professeth himselfe to consent to the peace or union made betwene *Iohn* and *Cyrill*: and a little after, <sup>nu. 192.</sup> *Vides non alia ex parte*; you see that this Epistle was approved by the Fathers at Chalcedon in another part or respect; but for that which *Ibas* signifieth in the last part of the Epistle, that hee consented, *omnibus pactis & conventis*, in all the conditions and covenants of the catholike union made betwene *Iohn* and *Cyrill*. And to omit many the like places, (for *Baronius* harps much upon this string) he repeateth this most plainly in this manner: <sup>u Anecdota 553. nu. 213.</sup> *In the end of this Epistle, Ibas the author of it doth testifie, that peace was made, that himselfe consented unto it, and rejoiceth therein, seeing he gives thanks to God for the same.* Now seeing the peace was concluded upon this condition; that *Nestorius* and his errors should be condemned, and the decrees of the Ephesine Councell received, it did plainly and necessarily ensue, that *Ibas* condemned *Nestorius* and approved the Ephesine Councell, and so the Popes Legates, and others at Chalcedon spake not amisse, when they said, that *Ibas* by that Epistle being read, was proved to bee a catholike. Thus disputeth the Cardinall for this impious Epistle, nor did he wholly devise this of himselfe, but he had the groud of it out of *Vigilius* his *apostolical*



x Vigil. Conf. an.  
192.

licall Constitutio, where he thus saith, *The Fathers at Chalcedon pronounced this Epistle of Ibas to be orthodoxall, propter illam pradicatorem fidei, for that professeion of faith, by which Cyril and Iohn, and all the Easterne Bishops made concord and union by the meanes of Paulus Bishop of Emisa, quam Ibas quoque in eadem Epistola laudans libenter amplectitur, which union and professeion of faith Ibas both praiseth in this Epistle, and gladly embraceth. So Vigilus.*

8. Here first of all must be observed the admirable acutenesse of the Pope and the Cardinall: They can see in the *Epistle of Ibas*, more than the whole fift generall Councell, than other succeeding, either Popes or generall Councells, more than the whole Catholike Church ever did, or could; more than all the world besides, excepting onely the Nestorians: They, and none but they of all the former could see by the latter end of that *Epistle*, or by the *union* mentioned therein, that either the *Epistle* was Catholike, or *Ibas* by it to be judged a Catholike. But *Vigilius* and *Baronius*, though in some matters they be as blinde as a Beetle, yet when they list, (and they ever list when they defend heresie) they can see farre into a Millstone: And yet, if it be well considered, they gaine not much by this their quicke sight, and quirke of the *union*, which they have spied in the end of that *Epistle*; for the whole fift Councell (approved by succeeding Councells, and by the whole catholike Church, as before we have declared) adjudgeth, not onely the beginning, and the middle, but the end also, even the whole *Epistle*, and every part, above all, and principally, the end thereof, to be blasphemous, and hereticall, they anathematize also as heretikes all who defend either the whole *Epistle*, or any part thereof, yea, all who doe not anathematize every part thereof: whence it is undeniably consequent, that both *Vigilius*, and his Procter *Baronius*, and all who doe, or shall hereafter herein defend them, yea, all who doe not anathematize them, are for this very quirke and subtilty of the *union* found in the latter part of this *Epistle*, anathematized, and condemned by the consenting judgment of the whole catholike Church. This have they gained as a just recompence for defending but the end onely of that *Epistle*, and much more for defending it by pretence of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, though they should condemne all the rest of it.

9. But if the matter be well considered, it will appeare that *Vigilius* by this one clause of the *union* makes good, not only the latter part, (as *Baronius* pretendeth) but even the whole *Epistle* of *Ibas*, for had he intended to approve no more than onely the latter part of that *Epistle*, his reason had beene this, The Fathers at *Chalcedon* approved that part of the *Epistle*, wherein the *union* is mentioned; therefore they approve the latter part of the *Epistle*, which is a meere nugation, proving *idem per idem*, for seeing the *union* is onely mentioned in the latter part, it is all one as if he had said, They approved the latter part, therefore they approved

y Tota Epistola baronica est, tota Epistola blasphemica est, hoc omnes dicimus. Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 576. b.

z Posterius inferius Epistola majoris impietate plena sunt. Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 564. a.

a Si quis defendit memoratam Epistolam, et non anathematizet eam, et defensores ejus, et eos qui dicunt eam rectam esse, vel partem ejus. Conc. 5. Coll. 8. in sententia Synodali. Anab. 14.

approved the latter part; and mee thinkes it sounds not well, to heare such nugatory, and frivolous reasons to proceed out so the infallible Chaire: Nor doth indeed *Vigilius* so conclude, but from that union and concord which the latter part of the Epistle testifieth *Ibas* to have approved, he inferres, that *Ibas* when hee writ this was a Catholike, and writ it as a Catholike, and so the writing, or Epistle it selfe to be Catholike, for thus stands his reason. The latter end of the Epistle sheweth, that *Ibas* praised the union betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrril*, and gladly embraceth it, and *propter illam fidei pradicacionem orthodoxa est Iba à patribus pronunciata declaratione*, therefore for that confession of faith, which *Ibas* by his Epistle sheweth that he embraceth, for that did the Fathers of *Chalcedon* pronounce the writing, or Epistle (not the end onely of it) to be orthodoxall: So he takes this one part, of which hee made no doubt but it was approved at *Chalcedon*, as a medium to prove that which was doubted, to wit, that the Epistle it selfe, even the whole Epistle was by the same Fathers approved; yea, and *Baronius* also, though hee in words pretends the contrary, yet seemes to be indeed of the same judgement, for he useth the very like reason as *Vigilius* doth, *quod ex illa*, because *Ibas* in this Epistle professeth himselfe to consent to the union, therefore *Patres dixerunt eam Epistolam ut Catholicam recipiendam*; the Fathers at *Chalcedon* said, that the Epistle (loe the Epistle, saith the Cardinall, nor a part onely of it) ought to bee received as Catholike.

b Vig. Const.  
nu. 191.

c Bar. an. 553. nu.  
191.

10. Which will be more plaine if we observe one other point out of *Vigilius* and *Baronius*, which may not well be omitted, for whereas all contained in any part of the Epistle respects things done, either before, or at, or after the union, in none of these, if ye will beleevethem, is this writing hereticall, or against the faith; for what was done before the union, though therein much be spoke against *Cyrril*, & the *Ephesine* Councell, and *Cyrril* called an heretike, yet is all that, saith *Baronius*, spoken by way of an historical narration, as declaring what was done, not as allowing that which was done; *ut ex hac parte nihil adversus Cyrrillum obloquentur videatur*, that in this part there is no wrong done to *Cyrril*. At the union, or when it was concluded, then was *Ibas* reconciled to *Cyrril*, and received to the communion of the Church; and so would not write against the faith, so teacheth the Cardinall; *Ibas*, saith he, tooke part with *Nestorius*, *usque ad tempus per Paulum Emisenum*; unill the time that the union was made by *Paul* Bishop of *Emisa*, *quando ipse sicut alij, communicare cum S. Cyrrillo, & Ecclesia Catholica cepit*; at which time *Ibas*, as the rest, began to communicate with *Cyrril*, and with the Catholike Church. *Vigilius* noteth the same, and out of him *Baronius* seemes to have borrowed it. By *Paulus* Bishop of *Emisa*, *Iohn*, *atque omnes orientales Episcopi*, and all the Easterne Bishops, (then *Ibas* among them) returned to concord with *Cyrril*. And *Baronius* further by the Epistle it selfe

d Bar. an. 448.  
nu. 71. Epistola bellarum continet rerum gestarum inter Iohannem & Cyrrillum, et que inter eos transacta essent, refert, &c.

e An. eodem. nu. 59.

f Vigil. Const. nu.  
192.

makes

g Bar. an. 448.  
nu. 75.

h Ba. an. 553. nu. 211

Wig. compl. nu. 194

k Bar. an. 553. nu.  
211.

makes this plaine, for by it, saith he, is declared, that *Ibas*, though before that time he had doated, *tunc temporis fuisse Catholicum*, yet then (to wit, when he writ this) *he was a Catholike*; and *Ibas* writ this Epistle, *eodem<sup>h</sup> momento pacis inisa*, at the *verie time and moment when the peace was made and concluded*; after which he never spake one undecent word against *Cyrril*: so at the time of the *union* being a Catholike, hee would not oppugne or write against the faith; much lesse after the time of the *union*, for after that time *Vigilius*<sup>i</sup> testifieth, that *Ibas* remained still a catholike, and in the catholike communion, *usque ad exitum* even to his dying day: And *Baronius* expresseth the same, saying<sup>k</sup>, that after the *union* it could not bee proved, *aliquod verbum indecens adversus Cyrillum protulisse*; that *Ibas* spake any unseemely word against *Cyrril*. Hereupon now it followeth, that the whole Epistle is to be approved, written by *Ibas* when he was a catholike, written with a catholike minde and affection; by him, who both at, and after the *union* would not write against the faith which himselfe professed; and what is spoken of matters before the *union*, that is all historically narrated, not by assent approved.

11. Oh how doe these men even labour and study to be miserable, and to tie more fast the knots of those Anathemaes denounced against them by the holy Councell; which nothing but renouncing their hereticall defences of this Epistle can ever dissolve! what will they doubt or feare to say, who would justifie that whole Epistle, as affirming nothing repugnant to the faith, (for a narration is no assertion of that which is related) of which the holy Conncell, and catholike Church hath pronounced, that it is wholly hereticall; and every part, head and taile, beginning and ending, an absolute, and positive deniall of the faith? what untruth will they not avouch, who deny *Ibas* after the *union* to have injured *Cyrril*, whereas the holy generall Councell witnesseth, and that truly, as you shall straight see, that even in this *union* which *Ibas* mentioneth, he wrongeth *Cyrril* and all catholikes more, than in any part of his Epist. yea, more than *Nestorius* himself ever did. But omitting for this time al the other untruths, which are not a few in those assertions of *Vigilius* and *Baronius*; there are two things therein, which I may not wel passe over in silence.

12. The former is, (at the consideration whereof I could not refrain from laughter) how curious, and even superstitious the Cardinall is in calculating the nativity of this impious Epistle, as if he had performed the office of *Inno Lucina* unto it, and knew the very moment of time when this faire babe was first brought to light: It was written, saith hee, *eodem momento pacis inisa*, in that very moment when the *union* was made betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrril*. At that very moment? Sure the Cardinals *Ephemerides*, or the constellations deceived him. It was neither written in that moment, nor in that moneth, nor in that yeare, nor at the least two whole yeares after the *union* was concluded: for the Epistle mentioneth



tioneth, not onely the praise of *Theodorus* of *Staphrasia*, but his commendation by *Rambulus*. Now, neither did the Nestorians so much honour, nor did the catholikes by name condemne *Theodorus*, till the Emperour had by his Edict straightly forbidden the reading, writing, hearing, or having of the bookes of *Nestorius*, till then the name and writings of *Nestorius*, being a Patriack, and of so eminent a citie as *Constantinople*, was faire more set to credit, and countenance their doctrines, than the name of *Theodorus*, being but a Bishop, and of a very obscure and ignoble towne, or corner rather, which in likelihood had bene buried in eternall oblivion, had not he by his owne infamy made it famous, as *Metastriatus* did himselfe by burning the temple of *Dionan* at *Ephesus*: But when both the name and bookes of *Nestorius* was now so detested by reason of the imperiall Edict, *Ibas* captivated *Theodori volumina circumferre*, saith *Liberatus*, then they began but to disperse the writings of *Theodorus*, with *Baronius* also confesseth, when the rivers, that is, *Nestorius* was stopp'd by the Emperours law, then the Nestorians ipsum fontem aperuere, opened the very fountains, divulging the bookes of *Theodorus*, and *Diadormus*. The Epistle then, mentioning the expresse condemning of *Theodorus*, doth of a certaintie follow that imperiall Edict against *Nestorius*: That Edict was published, as by the date appears, in *August*, when *Theodosius* was the fifteenth time Consul. The union betwixt *John* and *Cyrill* was made the next yeare after the Ephesine Councell: for *John* writing to *Xistus* Bishop of *Rome*, and testifying his unitie and consent to *Cyrill*, saith in that Epistle, that the Ephesine Councell was held *anno proximo lapsa, the yeare next before*. The Councell at *Ephesus* both began and ended in the yeare when *Antiochus* and *Bassus* were Consuls. Betwixt *Valerian* and *Atius*, (who were next Consuls after *Antiochus* and *Bassus*, and in whose Consulship the union was fully concluded,) and the fifteenth Consulship of *Theodosius*, wherein the Edict against *Nestorius* was published, are two intire Consulships, as by the *Rossi*, and others is certaine. So that it is certaine, that the Epistle which mentioneth the condemning by name of *Theodorus*, was not written till more then two compleat yeares after the union ended: but how long after these two yeares it was, before *Ibas* writ it, is wholly uncertaine, in likelihood it was two or three more: for some time after the Edict must bee allowed for the Nestorians, to translate first, and then disperse the bookes of *Theodorus*: some more after that, for the condemning of him by *Rambulus*: some againe after that, before *Rambulus* dyed, to whom *Ibas* succeeded in the Bishopricke of *Edessa*: and who writ this Epistle, when hee was in possession of that See, as both the title and contents of the Epistle declare. By all which,

*I Metastriatus, ut memora memoria sceleris extendat, in edictum nobilis fabrica (quod inter 7. orbis miracula ualebat) manus suas struxit, sicut ipse fassus est. Sol. n. ca. 53. Sirab. li. 14. & Val. Max. lib. de Cupidit. gloria. lib. 8. ca. 14. m Liber. ca. 10. n Bar. an. 435. au. 3. o Leg. ult. de hereticis. cod. Theod. p l. c. de synod. q Placit. de iur. quod. in sacra sententia acquiescere. Epist. Iohannis ad Xistum. Act. Conc. Eph. 10. ca. 17. r Act. Conc. Eph. 10. ca. 1. ubi habitabit dicitur Synodus post Conc. 13. Theodosius anno autem post istum Consulatum, Antiochus & Bassus erant Consules, ut ex Marcell. in Chron. & fassus certum est. Et 10. 3. Act. Eph. ca. 17. littera Imper. ad Synodum data sunt Antiocho Consule. Caput autem Concilium 13. die Maij eo anno. 10. 2. Act. ca. 1. & finitum est post quatuor (ut Liber. ca. 7.) vel post 3. menses ut Socrates ait lib. 7. ca. 33. & 37. s l. c. an. Ch. 431. Mare. in Ch. & Bar. in eum annum. t An. 433. Theodosius 14. et Maximus (Coff. an. 434. Ariobinda & Aspar. Coff. an. 435. Theodosius 15. et Valens. 4. Coff. Passi.*

*et Marcell. & Bar. u Proemium Epistolae Iohannis Epistolae Iohannis. Com. Chak. Act. 10. u Quibus ut unus (qui Theodorus condemnatus) extitit (sola ecclesia scribitur extitit) nostra cunctis in synodis, ibidem sita. loc. citat. synodus autem nomen significari Rambulum testatur Liber. ca. 10. ubi sit ait, De quo (Rambulo) successit Ibas Ibas in epistola sua dicitur (Theodorus) presumpsi, qui omnia presumpsi, apud in ecclesia sua quibusdam, etc.*

and if there were none else, by the last onely, that *Ibas* writ this, being Bishop of *Edeffa*, it is cleere, that some good while, in likelihood three or foure yeares, were past after the *union*, before *Ibas* writ this Epistle, of which *Baronius* tells us so precisely, that it was writ, *eo momento*, at the very moment, and instant when the peace was concluded.

13. The other point, to be observed is, what manner of a Catholike Pope *Vigilius*, and Cardinall *Baronius* have here set forth unto us. *Ibas* when he writ this Epistle, is with them a Catholike, a Catholike Writer, a Catholike Bishop; in him you shall see the lively portrature of one of their Catholikes. Hee even in this Epistle, written after the *Vnion* (when he was as they teach, a Catholike) denyeth God to be incarnate, and *Marietobe the Mother of God*: he condemnes the holy Ephesine Councell, and the twelve Chapters of *Cyrril*, hee commends *Theodorus of Mopsuestia* for a Preacher of the truth, while he lived, for a Saint being dead. These are the doctrines of *Ibas*, all of them taught positively, and avouched, (not as the Cardinall fancieth, historically related) in his Epistle, as the words themselves do shew, & the whole fifth Councell witnesseth, all taught by him, after the *Vnion*, when he was one of the Popes and Cardinalls Catholikes, yea taught consonantly to the *Vnion* which *Ibas* then embraced, yet *Ibas* teaching, writing, and maintaining all these blasphemies and heresies, that is, oppugning with all his art and ability the whole Catholike faith, is crowned and canonized by *Vigilius* and *Baronius* for a good Catholike. Of such Catholikes their Romane Church hath great store; nay, seeing none is now of their Church, who approves not all the Cathedrall decrees of their Popes, and therefore this of *Vigilius* among the rest, it hence ensueth, that none is now a Romane Catholike, that is, a member of their present Romane Church, who approves not *Ibas*, such as he was when he writ this Epistle, for a Catholike, that is, who approves not the most blasphemous heretikes, and oppugners of the whole faith, to be Catholikes, and who condemnes not the *Cyrrilians*, that is, all that maintaine the Catholike faith, for heretikes.

14. But still as yet the doubt concerning the *Vnion* remaineth: *Ibas*, say they, when he writ this Epistle embraced the *union* with *Cyrril*, and none can embrace that *union* but hee shewes himselfe thereby to bee a Catholike. True; none can truly and sincerely embrace that *union* which *Cyrril* made with *John*, the condition whereof was the subscribing to the holy Ephesine Synode, and condemning of *Nestorius*, with his doctrines, but hee is and must be acknowledged to be a good Catholike. Had *Ibas* approved that *union* or consented unto it, *Ibas* had not beene *Ibas*, he had never written that impious Epistle, which in every part, & most of all in the end, where hee speaks of the *union*, is repugnant to that holy *union*. It is the *union* in Nestorianisme, the union in op-

pugning

1 *Vig. Const. nu.*  
194. & ibidem tunc  
temporis (cum hanc  
Epistolam momento  
ipsa unionis scripsit)  
Catholicum fuisse.  
*Bar. an. 448. nu. 75.*

2 *Vide Epistolam*  
ipsam, & hoc cla-  
rum erit.  
a *Cons. s. coll. 6. pa.*  
575. & 576.

pugning and overthrowing the whole Catholike faith, which *I* *was* when he writ this Epistle embraced, and which in his Epistle he commendeth, which that it may appeare to all, wee are now to unfold the mystery of that union with *Cyrril*, under colour whereof *the* first, then *Vigilius*, and lastly *Baronius* with all who hold the Popes judgement to bee infallible, doe very cunningly convey their hereticall doctrines, and contradict the Catholike faith.

15. The Nestorians being loth to forsake, or have it thought that any of them did forsake their heresies, and being withall most desperately given to lying and slander, set forth a forme of union, forged by themselves, wherein they made *Cyrril*, and all who consented to him, that is, all Catholikes, to condemne their former Catholike doctrine decreed at the Ephesine Synod, and to assent to their heresies. And, as if this had bene the true union, and the conditions of peace agreed upon betwixt *Cyrril* and *Iohn*, they every where buzzed this into the eares of their sectaries, and spread abroad the copies thereof, triumphing in it, that now they had wonne the field, that *Cyrril* and all his partakers had now consented to Nestorianisme, and that upon this consent a generall union and peace ensued in the Church. This and no other is the union which *Iohn* in his Epistle embraceth, and by consenting whereunto Pope *Vigilius* decreeth, and *Baronius* defendeth *that* to be a Catholike, to which union whosoever consenteth, or approveth others, consenting to it, they doe even by that one act, besides all the rest, infallibly demonstrate themselves, not onely to be Nestorians, and to approve all the heresies and blasphemies of *Nestorius*, but to be in the most base, abject, and low degree of all Nestorians, even such as by lyes and calumnies strive to uphold their heresies.

16. For prooves whereof, I shall produce records above exception: and first of all *Cyrril*'s owne testimony. *Acacius* the worthy Bishop of *Melaene* hearing by the report which the Nestorians had spread abroad, that *Cyrril* in making the union had consented to the Nestorian doctrine of two natures (making two persons) in Christ, contrarie to his owne 12. Chapters, certified *Cyrril* of this report: *Cyrril* writ unto him at large, declaring the contrarie, and assuring him, that it was but a meere calumnie devised against him: *They reprove and upbraid us, saith he, as if formerly, we had thought the quite contrarie to those things which now (at the union) we have written, and I understand that they object also unto us, quod novam fidei expositionem vel symboli receperimus, has we have now (at the union) embraced a new Creed; or new exposition of the faith, rejecting that old and venerable Creed: Thus did the Nestorians accuse Cyrril, as himselfe testifieth: but what answered he for himselfe? At Antioch sicut loquitur, & cor ejus non meditatur, he calls them in plaine termes, fooles and liars: the fooles speaketh foolishly, and his heart meditates lyes. And in the end*

b Ex altera parte quidam de palatio culpaverunt Cyrrilum, eum suscepisse ab orientis fidei & piscopis duarum confessionem naturarum, quod Nestorius dixit & docuit. hoc ipse Valerianus, & Acacius videbatur. Liber. ca. 8. c Cyrril. Epist. ad Acac. 10. 5. Ab. Conc. Epist. an. 4. pag. 4. 836.



he warneth *Acatius* not to give credit to the counterfeit Epistle, or forme of union, which the Nestorians had forged and spread abroad in his name. If any Epistle, saith he <sup>d</sup>, be caried about as written by me, tanquam de his qua Ephesus etiam sunt, jam dolente, et penitentiam agente, contemnatur: as if I did now (since the union) sorrow and repent for those things which were done and decreed at Ephesus, let such an Epistle be condemned: Nay the Greeke is more emphaticall, *ἡ δὲ τῶν σκώρων καὶ ἐκείνων ἐκείνην ἐπιτομήν* scorne and deride every such writing. The like almost doth *Cyrrill* write to *Dynatus* Bishop of *Nicopolis*, who upon the Nestorians slanderous reports, suspected as it seemeth the very same of *Cyrrill*, as *Acatius* did. *Cyrrill* <sup>e</sup> having declared the certaine truth of these matters unto him, saith in the end, *It is needfull that you should know the cleare truth of these matters; lest some men who doe vainly <sup>f</sup> and fallily report one thing for another, should trouble any of the brethren: Perinde ac si nos qua contra Nestorij blasphemias scripsimus, retractaremus* <sup>g</sup>, as if wee had (upon the union) recalled, revoked or denied, those things which we have written before against the blasphemies of *Nestorius*.

17. Besides these indubitate testimonies of *Cyrrill*, the Nestorians themselves doe manifest this their calumnie: For although *Iohn* and those Easterne Bishops who in their Councell at *Antioch*, subscribed to that holy profession of faith which was sent from *Cyrrill* unto them, who were by farre the greater part, and who therefore are counted the Easterne Church, though these I say, were as they well deserved, received into the Catholike Communion, when the union was concluded, yet is it most untrue which *Vigilius* affirmeth, and takes it for a ground of his error touching *Ibas*, that *omnes <sup>h</sup> orientales Episcopi per Paulum Emisenum ad concordiam redierunt*, that all the Easterne Bishops by *Paulus Emisenus* returned to the unity and communion of the Church. They did not all, not *Helladius*, not *Euthemius*, not *Hemerius*, not *Dorotheus*, for whose restoring to their Sees, (for they were deposed) *Paulus* did earnestly labour with *Cyrrill*, but not being able to prevaile for them, *manserunt in eodem schismate, in quo etiam nunc perseverant*, they continued in their former schisme, as rent from the Church: and so they do now also remaine, nor was there in the covenants of peace, any mention of them, as *Cyrrill* <sup>i</sup> expressly affirmeth. But I will onely insist upon two of the principall sticklers in the Nestorian heresie, and who most concerne our present cause: *Theodoret* and *Ibas*.

18. *Theodoret* beleeving the reports of his fellow Nestorians that the Catholikes at the time of the Union had revoked their former doctrines, and consented to Nestorianisme, insulted over them in a publike oration <sup>k</sup> at *Antioch*, before *Domnus*, in this manner: *Vbi sunt dicentes, quod Deus est qui crucifixus est?* where are those that say that he was God, who was crucified? God was not crucified, but the man *Iesus Christ*, hee who is of the seed of *David*, was crucified: *Christ* is the Sonne of *David*, but

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.* pa. 837. a.

<sup>e</sup> *Cyrrill. Epist. ad Dynatum qua est 38. & extat tom. 5. A.B. Epb. ca. 16. separata.*

<sup>g</sup> *et provocantur.*

<sup>h</sup> *Vig. Const. nu. 192*

<sup>i</sup> *Cyrr. Epist. ad Dynatum.*

<sup>k</sup> *Qua extat in Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 559.*

but he is the temple of the sonne of God. *Non jam est contentio, Oriens & Egyptus sub uno iugo est, There is now no contention, the East, and Egypt* (that is, all who hold as *Cyrril* did) *are now both under one yoke.* Thus triumphed *Theodoret* over the Catholikes, supposing (as the Nestorians slanderously gave out) that *Cyrril* and all that held with him, that is, all Catholikes, had submitted themselves, to the yoke of their Nestorian heresie; that Christ is not God, nor that God was either borne of *Mary*, or suffered on the Crosse. And this being spoken by *Theodoret*, after the death of *Cyrril*, which wastwelve<sup>1</sup> yeares after the union made, doth demonstrate the obstinate and malicious hatred of the Nestorians against the truth, who notwithstanding *Cyrril* had often by words, by writings, testified that report, to be nothing else, but a slanderous untruth, yet in all that time, would not be perswaded, to desist from that calumny, but still let it passe for currant among them, and insulted, as if *Cyrril* and the Catholikes at the time of the union had condemned their former faith, and consented to Nestorianisme. So hard it is to re-clame those who by selfe-will are wedded to any hereticall opinion.

<sup>1</sup> Nam unio facta  
an. 432. *Cyrril*, autem  
obijt an. 444. Bar-  
in illo ann.

19. The other is *Ibas*, the Popes owne Catholike doctor, whom, at that very time when hee wrote this *Epistle* (which was long after the Union made betwixt *Iohn*, and *Cyrril*) to have embraced no other then this slanderous union, or union in Nestorianisme, those very words in the later part of his *Epistle*, out of which *Vigilius*, and *Baronius* would prove him to bee a Catholike, even those words I say, doe so fully and manifestly demonstrate, that you will say, if not sweare, that nothing but the love of Nestorianisme could so farre blind them, as to defend that part of his *Epistle*, or undertake by it to prove *Ibas* to be a Catholike. The words of *Ibas* are these<sup>m</sup>. After that *Iohn* had received the Emperors letters, compelling him to make agreement with *Cyrril*; hee sent the most holy Bishop *Paulus* of *Emisa*, writing by him a true profession of faith, and denouncing unto him, that if *Cyrril* would consent to that profession, and anathematize those who say that the Godhead did suffer (which opinion the Nestorians slandered *Cyrril*, and all Catholike to hold) and also those who say that there is but one nature (that is, one natural subsistence or person) of the divinity and humanity in Christ; then would he communicate with *Cyrril*. Now it was the will of God, who alwaies taketh care for his Church, which hee hath redeemed with his owne blood, to subdue the heart of the Egyptian (that is *Cyrril*) that he presently consented to the faith, and embraced it, and anathematized all who beleaved otherwise. So they (*Iohn* and *Cyrril*) communicating together, the contention was taken away, peace was made in the Church, and now there is no schisme but peace, as of late there was. And that you may know what words were written, by the most holy Archbishop *Iohn*, and what answer hee received backe from *Cyrril*, I have to this my writing adjoyned

<sup>m</sup> Habentur tum in  
Conc. Chal. Act. 10.  
tum in Con. 5. Coll.  
6. pa. 561.

ned their very Epistles, that your Holinesse reading them may know, and declare to all our Fathers that love peace, that the contention is now ceased, and the partition wall is now taken away, and that they (hee meaneth Cyrill and the Catholikes) who had before seditiously enveined against the living (Nestorius) and the dead (Theodorus) are now confounded, making satisfaction for their faults, & contraria docentes sua priori doctrina, and now teach the contrarie to their former doctrine. For none now dare say, that there is one nature (that is, one naturall subsistence or person) of the divinity and humanity, but they confesse and beleve, both in the temple, and in him who dwelleth in the temple, who is one Sonne, Iesus Christ. And this I have written to your Sanctitie, out of that great affection which I beare to you, knowing that your holinesse doth exercise it selfe, night and day, in the doctrine of God, that you might be profitable unto many. Thus farre are the words of Ibas, written unto Maris an hereticke<sup>n</sup> of Persia, and writ not as a private letter, but as an *Encyclicall Epistle* to bee shewed and notified to all that love peace, that is, according to their hereticall dialect, to all that loved Nestorianisme in Persia, and in the places adjoyning, to be a comfort and encouragement to them, to persist in their heresie, to which even Cyrill himselfe, and all Catholikes had upon better advice, at the time of the union with Iohn, consented.

20. In which words any who hath though but halfe an eye of a Catholike, cannot chuse but clearly discern, the very poison, and malice of all the heresies, and practises of the Nestorians, to be condensate and compact together. First, here is expressed their maine heresie, that Christ is not God, as the house is not the man who dwellerh in the house. Secondly, is set downe a notorious slander against Cyrill and the Catholikes, that they at the union made with Iohn, did anathematize all who held one naturall subsistence, or one person to be in Christ; that is, in effect did accurse all Catholikes, and the whole Catholike Faith. Thirdly, it is a notable untruth, that Cyrill made the union with Iohn upon this condition, that hee should anathematize all who hold Christ to be one person, the condition was quite contrarie, to wit, that Iohn, and they on his part, should anathematize all who denied Christ to be one, or who affirmed him to be two persons. Fourthly, it is a slander, that Cyrill writ an Epistle to that effect, as if he assented to that condition mentioned by Ibas. The Epistle is testified by Cyrill himselfe not to bee his, but a counterfaite writing, forged by the Nestorians. Fifthly, it is a Calumnie, that Cyrill and the rest who condemned Nestorius and Theodorus were seditious persons: it is as much as to say, that the holy Ephesine Councell, was a conspiracie and seditious conventicle. Sixtly, it is an unexcusable slander and untruth, that Cyrill and they who held with him, that is, the Catholikes, that they were confounded, and repented of their former doctrines, or writ contrarie unto them. These, besides divers

*n Ad Maris Persam, hereticum. Com 3. Coll. 8. pa. 58y. b.*



divers the like, are the flowers wherewith the latter part of that *Epistle* is deckt, even that part which Pope *Vigilius* and *Baronius* doe so magnifie, the one defining, the other defending, that by it *Ibas* ought to be judged a Catholike, and his *Epistle* receiv'd as Catholike: This part above all the rest, is so stuffed with heresies and slanders, that I doe constantly affirme, that none of all their Romane Alcumists can extract or distill one dramme of Catholike doctrine, or any goodnesse out of it. Only Pope *Vigilius*, being, as I have often said, blinded with Nestorianisme, and Cardinall *Baronius*, being infatuated with the admiration of their Pontificall infallible Chaire, they two by the new found art of Transubstantiating, wherein that sect excelleth *Iannes* and *Iambres*, and all the inchanters in the world, they by one spell or charme of a few words pronounced out of that holy chaire, can turne a serpent into a staffe, bread into a living bodie, darkenesse into light, an hereticke into a Catholike, yea the very venome and poyson of all Nestorianisme, into most wholsome doctrines of the Catholike faith: such, as that none may write, speake, or thinke ought to the contrarie.

21. See ye not now, as I foretold that you should, both the Pope; and the Cardinall, marching under the banner of *Nestorius*, and like two worthy Generalls, holding up a standard to the Nestorians, and building in the Romane Church, but very cunningly and artificially, a Capitoll for Nestorianisme? They forsooth will not in plaine tearmes say that Nestorianisme is the Catholike faith; that Christ is not God; that the Sonne of *Mary* is not the Sonne of God; that *Cyrril* is an hereticke; and the holy Ephesine Councell hereticall: Fie, these are too *Beotick*, and blunt; they could never have gotten any one to tast of that cup of Nestorianisme, had they dealt so plainely, or simply rather; *Rome* and *Italy*, are Schooles of better manners, and of more civilitie and subtiltie: you must learne there to speake heresie in the *Atticke Dialect*, in smooth, plausible, sweet and sugred tearmes; you must say the union which *Ibas* in his *Epistle* embraceth is the Catholike union, that *Ibas* by embracing that union was a Catholike; and ought to bee judged a Catholike; that whosoever embraceth not this union, which the Pope hath defined to be the Catholike communion; cannot be a Catholike: or if you speake more briefly and *Laconically*, you may say, the Popes decrees and *Cathedrall* judgements in causes of faith are infallible. Say but either of these, you say as much as either *Theodorus* or *Nestorius* did; you deny Christ to bee God; You condemne the Ephesine Councell, you speake true Nestorianisme, but you speake it not after the rude and rusticke fashion; but in that purest Ciceronian phrase which is now the refined language of the Romane Church. By approving this union, or the Popes decree in this cause of *Ibas*, you drinke up at once all the blasphemies and heresies of *Nestorius*, even the very dregs of

of Nestorianisme; yet your comfort is, though it be ranke poison, you shall now take it as an antidote, and soveraigne potion, so cunningly tempered by Pope *Vigilius*, and with such a grace and gravity commended, reached, and brought, even in the golden cup of *Babylon*, by the hands of Cardinall *Baronius* unto you, that it killeth, not onely without any sense of paine, but with a sweet delight also, even in a pleasing slumber and dreame of life, bringing you, as on a bed of downe, unto the pit of death.

22. See here again their *Synoniā* art. Oh how nice & scrupulous is *Baronius* in approving, or allowing *Vigilius* to approve the former part of this *Epistle of Ibas*? The *Epistle* was in no other part, but onely in the last concerning the union approved. Why? there is nothing at all in the former, no heresie, or impiety set downe in it, which doth not certainly and unavoydably ensue upon the approving of that union in Nestorianisme, which *Ibas* embraceth in the latter part. Why then must the latter, and not the former be approved? Forsooth in the former part the blasphemies of the Nestorians are in too plaine and blunt a manner expressed; *Cyrill* is an Apollinarian; The twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*, *omni impietate plena sunt, are full of all impietie*. The *Ephesine* Councell unjustly deposed *Nestorius*, and approved the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*, which are *contraria verae fidei*, and such like. It is not for a Pope or a Cardinall to approve such plaine and perspicuous heresies; they might as well say, We are heretikes, wee are Nestorians; which kinde of *Beotifisme* is farre from the civility of the Romane Court: But in the latter part the heresies of *Nestorius* and all his blasphemies are offered in the shew of union, with *Cyrill*, and communion with the Church, and comming under the vaur of that union, as in the wombe of the Trojan horse, the Pope and the Cardinall may now with honour receive them; the union (and with, or in it all Nestorianisme) must be brought into the City, the Pope and the Cardinall will themselves put their hands to this holy worke, *pedibusque rotarum subiiciunt lapsum, et stupca vincula collo interduunt*, themselves will drag and hale it with their owne shoulders to within the wals: nor is that enough, it must be placed in the very Romane Capitoll, in the holy temple, and consecrated to God, and that the Pope himselfe will doe by an *Apollinarian* and infallible constitution: by that immutable decree is this union set up as the Catholike union, *Et monstrum inferis sacra sistitur arce*, this unholy and unhappy union is now embraced, by which all the gates of the City of God are set wide open for all heresies to rush in at their pleasure, and make havocke of the Catholike faith.

23. Now it is not unworthy our labour to consider whether *Vigilius* and *Baronius* did in secret ignorance, or wittingly embrace this union mentioned by *Ibas*, that is in troth, all Nestorianisme. And for *Vigilius*, if any will be so favorable, as to inter-

o Bar. an. 553.  
nu. 192.

p Vid. Epist. Iba  
loc. cit.

pret all this to have proceeded of ignorance, I will not greatly contend with him. It is as great a crime for their *Romano Apollo*, and as foule a disgrace to their *infallible Chaire* upon ignorance to decree an heresie, as to do it upon wilfull obstinacy; yerto confess the truth; I am more than of opinion that *Vigilius* not upon ignorance, but out of a settled judgment & affection w<sup>ch</sup> he bare to Nestorianisme decreed this union, and with it the doctrines of *Nestorius* to be embraced: And that which induceth mee so to judge, is the great diligence, care, and circumspection which *Vigilius* used to enforme both himselfe and others in this matter; for besides that this cause was debated, and continually discussed in the Church for the space of six yeares and more, before the Pope published this his *Apostolicall Constitution*, (all which time *Vigilius* was a chiefe party in this cause) himselfe in his decree witnesseth concerning this *third Chapter*, or *Epistle of Ibas*; that he examined it, *diligenti investigatione*, by a diligent inquiry; yea, that he perused his bookes most diligently for this point, and concludeth both of it, and the rest, that hee decreed these things, *cum omni undique cautela atque diligentia*; with all possible care and diligence that could be used: And because, *plus videns oculi quam oculus*, hee added to his owne the judgement of an whole Synod of Bishops, all of them bending their eyes, wits, & industry to find out the truth in this cause. Further yet *Vigilius* speaketh in this cause of *Ibas* not doubtfully, but in words proceeding from certaine knowledge and resolute judgment, *disculde, aperteque reperimus, evidenter advertimus, apertissimum monstrantur praeuisse consensum, evidenter declaratur, in Iba Episcopo nihil in confessione fidei fuisse reprehensum, illud indubitanter pater, apertissima lucet veritate ex verbis Epistola, constat eundem Ibas communicatorem Cyrilli fuisse toto vita ejus tempore, luce clarius demonstratur*: All which doe shew, that *Vigilius* spake out of his settled judgement and resolution; after most diligent examination of this cause. Now that the whole *Epistle*, and, of all parts, that especially where *Ibas* intreateth of the union, that this is full of Nestorianisme, is so evident, that scarce any, though but of a shallow judgement, who doth with ordinary diligence peruse and ponder the same, can otherwise chuse than observe, and see it. Wherefore I cannot thinke but that *Vigilius* both saw and knew that part of the *Epistle*, above all the rest, to containe the doctrines of *Nestorius*, and an approbation of them all, and that by approving the union there mentioned, he approved all the doctrines of the Nestorians.

p Vig. Const. nu. 186.  
q Gesa Concilij  
bale. diligentissime  
perquirentes. Ibid.  
r Ibid. nu. 108.

f Nu. 186.  
g Nu. 190.  
u Ibid.  
x Nu. 193.  
y Nu. 195.  
z Nu. 196.  
a Nu. 198.  
b Nu. 207.

24. But for cardinall *Baronius*, that hee in defending the latter part of this *Epistle*, as doth *Vigilius* before him; that in striving so earnestly by it to prove *Ibas* to have bene a catholike, and his *Epistle* to be orthodoxall, at least in the latter part, because *Ibas* assented to the union mentioned therein; that he say did herein wittingly, willingly, and obstinately labour to maintaine



taine the condemned heresie of Nestorius: for my owne part I cannot almost doubt, nor, as I thinke, will his best friends when they have well considered of his words: He intreating of this matter touching Ibas and his Epistle, in another place, where this Constitution of Vigilius comes not to the scanning, and so did not dimme his sight, ingenuously there confesseth, that this Epistle is hereticall, written by a Nestorian, written of purpose to disgrace Cyrill, and the catholikes, as if they at the union had recanted their former doctrines. But let us heare his owne words.

c Bar. an. 432. nu.  
68. absc. condemna-  
tione suorum Capitu-  
lulorum, cuncta  
arbitrio Cyrilli gesta  
sunt.  
d An. eod. nu. 69.  
e Ibid. nu. 70.

f Ibid. nu. 71.

25. He having shewed<sup>e</sup> that the union was made in every point according to Cyrills minde, and without the condemning of his twelve Chapters, addeth this, They<sup>d</sup> who favoured Nestorius spread abroad a rumour, that Cyrill had in all things consented unto Ibas, and condemned his former doctrines: and a little after declaring<sup>e</sup> how the Nestorians did slander Cyrill, he saith, Besides others, who tooke part with Nestorius, even Theodoret also, *issidem aggressus est Cyrillum urgere calumnijs, vexed Cyrill with the same slanders, that he had condemned his owne Chapters; and then comming to this Epistle of Ibas, he thus writeth, Who so desired to see further the sleights of the Nestorians let him reade the Epistle, which is said to be the Epistle of Ibas unto Maris, wherein any may see the Nestorian fellow insulting and triumphing, as if the cause had beene adjudged to him, & jactantem Cyrillum penitentem, tandem recantasse pœnitentiam, and waunting that Cyrill repenting himselfe of his former doctrines, did now at last revoke the same, and sing a new song. And this the author of that Epistle writ, and sent abroad as a Circular Epistle, to be read throughout the Provinces, pro solatio eorum, & ignominia Catholicorum; for the comfort of the Nestorians, and for the disgrace of Catholikes, Thus Baronius. Professing as you see, that he knew this Epistle to be hereticall, and that even in the latter end, which Vigilius and himself defendeth as orthodoxall, yea, evē in that very point touching the union mentioned in that Epistle, to be a meere calumnie against Cyrill, and the Catholikes, as if they, by making the union, had consented to Nestorianisme, and renounced the Ephesine Councell, and the Catholike faith.*

26. Seeing now the Card. knew all this to be true, and yet afterwards for defence of Vigilius and his Constitution, teacheth and maintaineth, that by embracing the union mentioned in this Epistle, Ibas was a Catholike, and was for this cause by the Councell at Chalcedon, and ought by all others to be adjudged a Catholike, is it not evident that the Cardinall wittingly and willingly maintaines hereby the union with the Nestorians to bee the catholike union, and so the doctrines of the Nestorians to bee the catholike faith? for this union mentioned in the Epistle, is, as the Cardinall professeth, an union in Nestorianisme, an union with Cyrill having now renounced the Ephesine Councell, and the catholike faith.

27. Onely there is one quirke or subtilty in the Cardinals words, which may not without great wrong unto him bee omitted, where he acknowledgeth this *Epistle* to be hereticall; & hereticall in this point of the union, there he will not have it to be the *Epistle of Ibas*, for then by it *Ibas* should bee judged a Nestorian, which would quite overthrow the Constitution of *Vigilius*: when in the other place he defends, as *Vigilius* decreeth, that *Ibas* by this *Epistle*, and by consenting to this union was a Catholike, and ought to bee judged a Catholike, there the *Epistle* is truly the *Epistle of Ibas*, but then consenting to this union is the note of a Catholike: So both this *Epistle* is the *Epistle of Ibas*, and it is not the *Epistle of Ibas*; and to consent to the union herein mentioned, is the note of a Nestorian heretike; and to consent to the same union, is the note of a good Catholike: Thus doth the Cardinall play, & sport himselfe in contradictions, and as the winde blowes and turnes him, so doth he turne his note also. If the winde blow to *Alexandria*, and turne the Cardinals face towards *Cyrrill*, then the union is hereticall, lest *Cyrrill* who condemned it, should bee condemned for an heretike. If the winde blow from *Africke*, and turne the Cardinals face towards *Rome* and Pope *Vigilius*, then the union is Catholike, lest *Vigilius* approving this union, should not be thought a Catholike. Or because a Cardinall so learned, so renowned as *Baronius*, may not be thought to contradict himselfe, or speake amisse in either place, let both sayings be admitted for true, and then it unavoidably followeth, that by the Cardinals divinity, and in his judgment, Nestorianisme is the Catholike faith, which aptly and easily will accord both his sayings, for so the author of this *Epistle* by approving this union shall be a perfect Nestorian, as in the one place is affirmed; and by approving this union shall be with all a perfect Catholike, as in the other place is avouched.

28. Besides this confession of *Baronius*, which is cleare enough, there is yet another meanes to demonstrate that the Cardinall by defending this latter part of the *Epistle* touching the union, did wittingly and wilfully maintaine the condemned herebe of *Nestorius*: for the fift generall Councell, approved, as wee have shewed, by the judgment of the whole Catholike Church, hath adjudged this very part of the *Epistle*; the defence whereof *Baronius* hath undertaken, not onely to bee hereticall, but to bee more full of blasphemies than any of the rest; it hath further judicially defined al that defend either this, or any part of that *Epistle*, to be heretikes, and for such it hath anathematized them, yea, all that write either for it, or for them. Now the Cardinall had read the whole fift Councell, as appeareth by that summary collection which he hath made of the *Acts*, and of every Collation thereof; nay, hee had not onely read these *Acts*, but peried earnestly with a jealous and carping eie, into every corner and sentence thereof, as you shall perceiue hereafter, and there-

g Videre est Nestorianum hominem, &c. Bar. an. 433. no. 77. h Non esse Iba comperta. Ibid.

i Vigilius asserere voluit ex ea Epistola Iba esse recipiendum, in qua nimirum ipse testatur se amplecti pacem ecclesie, quod recepta, necesse fuerit eundem probare Catholicum. Bar. an. 533. nu. 191.

k Posteriora enim inserta Epistola, majori impietate plena sunt. Cyrrillum et similia ei sapientes injuriantia, et omnino impiam scellam Nestory vniuersantia. Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 564. a. Scimus et nos hac ita subsc. quata est, &c. Ibid. l Qui dicit eam rectam esse, vel partem ejus. Coll. 8. pa. 587. b. m Eos qui scripserunt vel scribunt pro ea. Ibid. n Extat in Annot. Bar. an. 553. a. nu. 33. ad 117.

fore

fore it is doubtlesse that hee knew the judgement of this fifth Council, concerning all that defend any part of this *Epistle*, and specially the latter part, which concernes the *union*. Neither only did he know that to be the judgement of this fifth Council, but (as himselfe expressly witnesseth) of all both Popes, and generall Councils which followed it, all of them approving this fifth Council, and the judgement thereof, whence it is cleare, that *Baronius* knew certainly himselfe by defending this part of this *Epistle* touching the *union*, to defend that which by the judgement of the fifth Council, and the whole Catholike Church ever since hath beene condemned for hereticall, and the defenders of it anathematized as heretikes: yet such was the Cardinals zeale, and ardent affection to Nestorianisme, that against the judgement of the whole Church knowne unto him, yea, knowne for this very cause to anathematize him, yet he defends the *union* there mentioned, and the latter part of that *Epistle*, wherein it is mentioned, that is in truth, all the blasphemies of *Nestorius*, choosing rather, by adhering to *Vigilius* and his hereticall decree, to be condemned, and anathematized by the whole Catholike Church for a Nestorian heretike, than by forsaking the defence of *Vigilius*, and his decree, to condemne this latter part of the *Epistle* of *Ibas*, touching the *union*, which containeth in it the very quintessence of all Nestorianisme.

29. I think it is now sufficiently apparent by that which wee have already said, that the union which *Ibas* in his *Epistle* mentioneth and embraceth, and which *Vigilius* first, and after him *Baronius* approveth, is not that true union in the Catholike faith, which *Cyrril* made with *Iohn* and other Easterne Bishops, but onely an union in Nestorianisme, and in denying the Catholike faith, to which the Nestorians falsely reported and slandered *Cyrril*, with the other Catholikes, to have consented, and thereby to have condemned and anathematized that truth, which the yeare before they had decreed at *Ephesus*; Yet for the full satisfaction of all, and clearing of all doubts which may arise, I will adde one thing further which will much more manifest both the calumnie of the Nestorians, and the constancy of Saint *Cyrril*, and that is, upon what colour or pretence the Nestorians raised this slanderous report, which I am the more desirous to explaine, because the narration of this matter is extreemly confounded, and entangled by *Baronius* and *Binius*, and that, as may be feared, even of set purpose, that they might either quite discourage others (as almost they had done my selfe) in the search of this truth, or at least misleade them into such by-paths, that they should not finde the truth in this matter.

30. When *Theodosius* the religious Emperour had written by *Aristolans* that earnest letter to *Iohn*, and the other Easterne Bishops, perswading, yea, commanding them to consent with *Cyrril*, and embrace the Catholike communion; they upon the Emperours



perors motion sought indeed to make an union with *Cyrill*, but they laboured to effect it by drawing *Cyrill* unto their bent, and to consent unto their heresies. This they first attempted by a letter of *Acatius* Bishop of *Berea*, willing him to write, in all their names unto *Cyrill*, that no unity, or concord could be made, but according to those conditions which themselves should prescribe: and the condition prescribed by them, was that *Cyrill* should abolish and condemne all that ever hee had written against *Nestorianisme*, and so both his twelve Chapters, and the *Ephesine* decree, and all the like. *Cyrill* answered with great confidence: *rem eos postulare qua fieri plane non posset, that they required a matter utterly impossible*, because what hee had written touching that matter, was rightly written, and in defence of the true faith, and therefore that he could not either condemne, or deny what he had written.

31. When it succeeded not this first way, they next attempted to effect the union by *Paulus* Bishop of *Emisa*, whom they sent to *Alexandria*, to negotiate for them both by words, and by a second letter which they sent by him. And although they were not in this second so violent as in the former of *Acatius*, yet they writ some things therein also, not fitting, nor allowable, for they reproved the holy *Ephesine* Councell, as if things had been spoken, and done therein amisse; What did *Cyrill* answer? *Huiusmodi epistolas equidem non admisi, truly I did not admit or allow of this their second Epistle neither*, seeing therein they did adde new contumelies, who should have asked pardon for the old. But where as *Paulus* did very earnestly excuse the matter, affirming, and that upon his oath also, that their purpose was not to exasperate *Cyrill*, but to accord with him, *dilectionis gratia excusationem admisi, I in charity was content to admit of this excuse*. And *Paulus* being very desirous to effect the union, consented to anathematize *Nestorius* and his heresies, to consent also to the deposing of *Nestorius*, and the electing of *Maximianus* in his place: which when *Paulus* had performed, and subscribed *sua chyrographo, with his owne hand writing*, (which was all that either the Emperor or *Cyrill* required) *ad synaxim recepi, I received him to the communion of the Church*. But when *Paulus* would further have perswaded *Cyrill*, that seeing he was sent in the name of the rest, and had subscribed this, *pro omnibus, & tanquam ex communi omnium orientalium persona, for them all, and as it were in the person of them all*: and therefore laboured with *Cyrill*, that this his subscription might satisfie for the others also, and that he would require no more of them, but be content with their letters which by him they had sent; *nullo ratione id fieri passus sum, saith Cyrill, I could by no means indure that*: I told *Paulus* also, that his subscription in condemning *Nestorius* and his heresies, *ipsi soli sufficere, could satisfie but only for himselfe*, but as for the rest, *Iohn*, and they must personally, and for themselves subscribe; or else they

N

could

p Apud Acatium  
Berensem Episcopum  
congressi, scribi ad  
me curarunt, pacem  
concordiamque, nisi eo  
modo quem prescri-  
berent, fieri non de-  
bere, Epist. Cyrilli ad  
Acatium, qua est  
29. & ext. tom. 5.  
Athen. Epist. 12. 7. &  
idem habetur in E-  
pist. Cyrilli ad Dyna-  
tum tom. ead. ca. 6.  
q Probat ut omni-  
bus qua aduersus  
Nestorium scripta  
sunt abolita & ve-  
luti inutilibus reje-  
ctis, &c. Epist. ad  
Dynam. & similia  
habentur in Epist. Cy-  
rilli ad Acat.  
locus cit.  
r Cyrill. Epistola ad  
Dynam. & ad Acat.  
s Misit enim Alexan-  
driam Paulum E-  
piscopum Emisenum  
&c. ibid.  
t Attulit quendam  
parum decore &  
comode proposita;  
ibid.

si Modis omnibus  
opus esse dixi ut Je-  
hannem scriptam de  
his confessionem ade-  
ret, &c. Cyrill. Epist.  
ad Acatium.

2. Nisi chartam qua  
significavi, si Iohannes  
illi subscripserit,  
tum communionem  
illis reddite. Cyril.  
Epist. ad Dynat.

1. Cum Johannes  
subscripsisset, veteris  
qui maiore auctori-  
tate apud ipsum  
erant, Cyril. Epist.  
ad Dynat.

2. Ea extat inter E-  
pist. Cyrilli Epist. 27.  
in Ali. Conc. E-  
pist. to. 5. ca. 5.

3. Miserrunt autem  
eandem Epistolam,  
quam ad me scripse-  
runt ad X. sum &  
Maximianum, Cy-  
ril. Epist. ad Dynat.

4. Placuit nobis Ne-  
storium prodeposui-  
tere, proutque  
illius prophaneque  
novitates anathe-  
matizare. Epist. Sy-  
nodali Iohanni  
Antioch. & Synodi  
Antioch. 10. 5. Ali.  
Epist. ca. 5.

5. Nos Dominum no-  
strum Paulum ad  
sanctitatem tuam  
mittendum duximus  
Epist. Ioh. & Synod.  
Antioch. loco jam ci-  
tato, & ex charta,  
quam Dominus meus  
Paulus nunc attulit  
evidenter cognosci-  
mus. Continet enim  
inculpam fidei  
confessionem. Cyril.  
Epist. 28. qua est ad  
Iohannem Antioch.  
& extat tom. 5. Ali.  
Epist. ca. 6.

6. Nempe 29. mensis  
Christi. Decembris.  
10. 6. Ali. Epist. ca.  
13. in tit.

7. Ibid. to. 6. ca. 13.  
8. Epist. Cyrilli 28.  
qua extat tom. 5.  
Ali. Epist. ca. 6.

could not bee received into communion : whereupon Cyril writ an orthodoxall profession \* to that same effect, whereunto Paulus had subscribed, and sent it unto Iohn, requiring his personall subscription to it. This was the summe of all that was done by Paulus at his first comming.

32. Paulus returning to Antioch, brought this resolute answer of Cyril, to Iohn, and the Bishops of his Synod. They seeing no other meanes to make an union, but onely by consenting to Cyril, and seeing that Paulus, whom they put in trust as their agent, had both himselfe consented, and further undertaken that Iohn and they should likewise consent unto the same which hee had done, did now at length yeeld to all the demands of Cyril: and for an assurance of their sincerity therein, they writ a Synodall \* and Encyclicall Epistle unto Cyril, which they likewise sent unto Pope Sixtus, to Maximianus, and other principall Bishops, wherein they first set downe a very sound, true and orthodoxall confession of their faith, and then testifie their willing assent and subscription, to the deposing <sup>b</sup> of Nestorius, and the condemning of his heresies.

33. This Synodall letter they sent to Cyril by Paulus <sup>c</sup> Bishop of Emisa, that he might make a finall peace, and union. At whose comming to Alexandria this second time, and bringing with him this undoubted testimony of the orthodoxie of Iohn, and the chiefe of the Easterne Bishops, and that they had now consented to all which either the Emperour, or Cyril required of them, the union was fully concluded on every part, and peace made in the Church : In token whereof Paulus preached at Alexandria, in the month of December <sup>d</sup>, making there before Cyril, and the whole City, so orthodoxall a profession of the faith, that the people for joy interrupting him foure or five times, exclaimed <sup>e</sup>, Bene venisti Orthodoxe, O Orthodox Paul thou art welcome to us, Cyril is orthodoxall, Paulus is orthodoxall : and Cyril for his part writ that learned Epistle <sup>f</sup> in congratulation unto Iohn, and the rest which beginneth, Let the Heavens rejoyce, and let the earth be glad, publishing it as an hymne of joy and thanksgiving for the union now effected in the Church, singing Glory unto God, and peace among men.

34. This is the true narration of the whole proceedings betwixt Cyril, and the Easterne Bishops touching this matter of the union, as they who diligently peruse the Epistles of Cyril to Acatus Bishop of Melitene, to Dynatus, and Iohn, and compare therewith the Epistle of Iohn, and the Synod of Antioch sent to Cyril and Xistus, will clearly perceive, whence three things may be observed : The first is the most shamelesse dealings of the Nestorians, who slandered Cyril to have at the time of the union consented in all points unto them, and to their heresie, and to have condemned his former doctrine, and the Ephesine Council, whereas the quite contrary was true. He was most inflexible and

and constant in maintaining the true faith; more inexorable than *Aeacus*, or rather; as *Moses* would not consent to *Pharaoh*, no, not in the least hoofe, so would not *Cyrrill* yeeld one heire-bredth unto them, but brought them to subscribe wholly, and in every point; to that which he desired.

g Exod. 10. 26.

35. The second is, the occasion which the Nestorians tooke for their pretended calumnie: They knew that *Iohn* and the Easterne Bishops had written to *Cyrrill*, willing him to condemne his owne Chapters; yea, that they had writ so resolutely, that unlesse *Cyrrill* did so, they would not consent unto any peace, or union. Thus much was true, as by the letter of *Asatius* Bishop of *Be-rea* to *Cyrrill* is evident: Now they saw that *Cyrrill* afterwards, and in that very yeare consented with *Iohn*, and made union with him, whereupon they boasted that *Cyrrill* did it upon the condition required by *Iohn* at the first; which was the condemning of his former doctrine; wilfully and maliciously concealing both how *Cyrrill* utterly denied to yeeld unto them, or to that condition required by them; and how at the length *Iohn*, and so many of them as were received into communion, consented wholly unto him, and subscribed to the Catholike faith. All this they quite suppress; and, to colour the matter, they forged a letter under the name of *Cyrrill*, as consenting to condemne his owne doctrine; which no doubt was the same letter that *Iohn* in his Epistle inclosed, and sent unto *Maria* the Heretike.

h Si qua Epistola a quibusdam circumferatur tanquam à me, de ijs que Ephesi allo sunt jam dolente, & penitenti agentie, perscripta, et quoque contentatur. Cyrrill. Epist. ad Asat. in fine.

i Ba. an. 432. nu. 54 k Consultus deliberatur, ratam habendam esse damnatione heresis Nestorianae. Ibid.

l Iohannes ex Synodo tunc Antiochie habita, de damnatione Nestori, et eius heresi, Synodalem dedit Epistolam. ib. m Haecenus Epistola communis omnibus quidem Episcopis Catholice fidei, qua Catholicam Ecclesiarum omnium communionem nanciscuntur. Bar. an. eodem nu. 56.

n Epistola illa extat in 5. Añ. Conc. Eph. ca. 17.

o Nam in utraque damnatur Nestorius, et illius heresis, et approbatur Synodus Ephesina, vide; et confer Epistolas. p Dedit Epistolam ad Sixtum. Bar. an. 432. nu. 54. que erat communis omnium Episcopis Catholicis. Ibid. nu. 56 q Ibid. nu. 57. r Ibid.

36. The third is, how *Baronius* hath perverted the narration of this union, and strengthened the calumnie of the Nestorians by his misreporting of the same: But first we must set downe the Cardinals words; Upon the Emperours letters (saith hee) sent unto *Iohn*, commanding him, and the rest, to agree with *Cyrrill*, *Iohn* and the Easterne Bishops met together in a Synod at Antioch, and they agreed to ratifie the condemnation of *Nestorius* and his heresie, as the Emperour had required them to doe, and so to make union with the Pope, with *Cyrrill*, and with the Catholike Church. According to this agreement they made a Synodall decree, and Synodall Epistle, containing the condemning of *Nestorius*, with his heresies, and an orthodoxal profession which they sent to Pope *Sixtus*, and other Catholike Bishops, to testifie their communion with them al. This Epistle by the way, is in effect the same which *Paulus* Bishop of *Emisa* brought; at his second coming into *Alexandria*. The Cardinall proceeding, tels us, that this Epistle was sent as common to all, save onely to *Cyrrill*; but as for *Cyrrill*, against whom they had most bitter enmity, aliter sibi agendum putarunt; they would take another course, and deale after another manner with him; and marke, I pray you, how that was, they would so deale with him, as ab eo exigenter Catholice fidei confessionem, quæ sua Capisula velut erroniam condemnaret; so that they would exact of him a Catholike confession, wherein hee should condemne his own twelve Chapters as erronious: and when *Cyrrill* refused so to doe,



in the next place they send *Paulus* Bishop of *Emisa*, as their Legate, unto *Cyrill*, *qui si posset ab eo quod petendum antea furat, extorqueret; who should, if by any meanes hee could, wring from Cyrill that which before they required;* (to wit, the condemning of his Chapters;) but if he could not doe that, nor prevaile therein with *Cyrill*, *tunc de damnatione Nestorij literas ei redderet; then they willed Paulus to deliver unto Cyrill their Synodall letters, written by them, containing the condemnation of Nestorius, and his heresie.* Thus *Baronius*; and *Binus* traceth him in these steps.

f Bin. Notis in Ch.  
Antioch. tempore  
Sixti.

37. In which narration of the Cardinall, besides many untruths wherewith it is stuffed, there are two things, above all the rest, to be observed. The former is, how wise and politike the Cardinall doth make *Iohn*, and the whole Synod of *Antioch*, to be in this matter of the unioy: first, they condemne the heresies of *Nestorius*, approve the *Ephesine* Councell, and by so doing approve the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*; they doe this in a Synod, and publish their Synodall decree at *Rome*, at *Constantinople*, and other places, to shew and testifie themselves to be truly orthodoxall; and when all this is done, they labour earnestly, with *Cyrill*, to make him condemne his owne twelve Chapters, which is in effect to maintaine Nestorianisme; to condemne the *Ephesine* Councell, (wherein his Chapters were approved) yea, to condemne their owne Synodall decree, by which themselves, at *Antioch*, had condemned *Nestorius*, and approved the Chapters of *Cyrill*. Againe, he makes *Iohn*, and his Synod to communicate with *Sixtus*, with *Maximianus*, with all other Catholikes save *Cyrill*, and them of his Patriarchship; with all the former they will communicate, though they all approved the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*; with *Cyrill* they will not communicate, unlesse he will condemne the same twelve Chapters. If they thought the twelve Chapters to be hereticall, why hold they communion with *Sixtus*, *Maximianus*, and others who approved them? nay, why did themselves approve them? If they thought them orthodoxall, why would they (being themselves orthodoxall) perswade, yea, enforce and wring out of *Cyrill* a condemnation of the orthodoxall faith? Besides, what a worthy peece of policy was this, which the Cardinall doth fasten upon *Iohn*, and all the rest? he makes them to send *Paulus*, a reverend Bishop, with a letter purposely to be delivered to *Cyrill*, which testified their Synodall, and willing consent in approving the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*, that is, of the Catholike faith, and yet command *Paulus* to urge and wring from *Cyrill*, if he could, a condemnation of those twelve Chapters, that is, of the whole Catholike faith? What deepe dissemblers and hypocrites doth hee make *Iohn*, *Paul*, and the rest of those orthodoxall Bishops? Lastly, of what faith or religion, doe you thinke, must *Iohn*, *Paul*, and the rest be, by the Cardinals narration. By their Synodall sentence, and holy confession therein, they approve the twelve Chapters

of

of *Cyrril*, and so are perfect Catholikes; againe, by their urging of *Cyrril* to condemne his twelve Chapters, they are perfect Nestorians, for the condemning of them, is the defending of all the Nestorian heresies; so, by the Cardinals divinity, they are at the selfe same time; both perfect Nestorians, and perfect Catholikes; which can no way be effected, but by admitting the Cardinals old position, which he learned of *Vigilius*, that perfect Nestorianisme is the perfect Catholike faith.

38. Into such labyrinths doth the Cardinals foule misrepor-  
ting of this matter leade, and even draw a man; whereas the  
truth, as, by that which formerly hath beene declared, is evident,  
that *John*, and the rest of the Synod, when they vrged *Cyrril* to  
condemne his Chapters, had not made that Synodall decree for  
condemning of *Nestorius*; & when they had once made that de-  
cree, they never, either by word or writing, urged *Cyrril* to con-  
demne those Chapters: Before they made that decree, and con-  
demned *Nestorius*, they were hereticall, and held communion  
neither with *Cyrril*, nor *Sixtus*, nor any other Catholikes: After  
they had made that decree, and condemned *Nestorius* with his  
heresies, they were orthodoxall, & communicated no lesse with  
*Cyrril*, thā with *Sixtus*, or any other Catholike; nay, they comu-  
nicated first of all with *Cyrril*, & then with all other Catholikes.

39. The other point to be observed out of the Cardinals words, is, that by his narration *Cyrril* did indeed, as *Ibas* and the Nestorians slandered him, renounce & reject the Catholike faith, for the Cardinall makes *Paulus* of *Emisa* but to goe once to *Alexandria* about the union, or if any can finde in the Cardinall a second journey thither, yet by his narratiō, the Synodall Epistle of *Iohn*, and the rest, wherein they condemne *Nestorius*, and set downe an orthodoxall profession, that Epistle was sent by *Paulus* at the first time; for he had withall in charge to urge *Cyrril* to condemne his twelve Chapters, which at his last going had beene absurd and incongruous. So then the Epistle which *Paulus*, at his first going to *Cyrril* brought with him, was the orthodoxall Epistle of *Iohn*, and the Synod. Now it is certaine by the expresse words of *Cyrril*, that the letter which *Iohn* and the rest, sent by *Paulus* at his first going, was rejected by *Cyrril*, for he saith of that Epistle, *huiusmodi epistolas non acceptavi, I did not accept this Epistle sent by Paul*: and the Cardinall citing those words of *Cyrril verbatim*, and making some prettie collection out of them, could not be ignorant hereof. Seing then by the Cardinals narration, the Epistle which *Paulus* brought at his first comming, was orthodoxall, and seeing it is certaine that *Cyrril* rejected that Epistle, which *Paulus* at his first comming brought from *Iohn*, it inevitably followeth, upon the Cardinals narration, that *Cyrril* indeed rejected an orthodoxall and Catholike profession, containing the condemnation of *Nestorius*, and his heresies, and therefore that *Cyrril* renounced

his former Catholike doctrine, & consented to Nestorianisme, which is the same calumnie wherewith *Ibas* in his impious *Epistle*, slandereth *Cyrril*. And although *Baronius* doe in words deny this, as I know hee doth, yet considering the deepe projects which the Cardinall hath, it may bee feared, that he meant by this meanes, cunningly, and closely, to lay a foundation to uphold that union, in which *Ibas* in his *Epistle* rejoyceth, and which *Vigilius* and the Cardinall himselfe approve for Catholike, or if the Cardinall intended not this, yet I am sure that hee hath then unwittingly devised, such a notable ground, to maintaine that slander, which *Ibas* imputeth to *Cyrril*, that at the time of the union he rejected his former doctrines, as that neither *Ibas* himselfe, nor any of the old Nestorians could possibly have forged a more faire and colourable pretence for the same.

40. My conclusion now of this their former reason, for defence of the impious *Epistle* of *Ibas*, drawne from the union mentioned therein, is this: Seeing that union mentioned and approved by *Ibas* in the later part of his *Epistle*, is no other but the union in Nestorianisme, unto which hee maliciously slandereth *Cyrril* to have consented: and seeing Pope *Vigilius*, and Cardinall *Baronius* not onely approve as Catholike, the union there mentioned by *Ibas*, but prove by it and consenting to it, both *Ibas* himselfe to bee a Catholike, and his *Epistle*, in that part at least, to be orthodoxall, it hence cleerely ensueth, that *Vigilius* by his *Apostolicall* sentence defineth, and *Baronius* by name (as also all who maintaine the Popes *Cathedrall* sentence in causes of faith to bee infallible) doe all defend Nestorianisme to be the Catholike union, and so Nestorianisme to bee the Catholike faith: which whosoever affirms, are by the judgement not onely of the first, but the fourth and third generall Councils, convicted, condemned, and anathematized heretickes.

## CHAP. XII.

*That Vigilius and Baronius in their later reason for defense of the Epistle of Ibas, taken from the words of Ibas, wherein hee confesseth two natures and one person in Christ, doe maintaine the heresies of Nestorians.*

1.



He other reason whereby they labour to defend this impious *Epistle*, and with no lesse fraud then they did in the former, is taken from the very confession of *Ibas*, set downe in his *Epistle*, wherein hee acknowledgeth Christ to have two natures, and to bee one person. His words to this purpose are these, neare the beginning of his *Epistle*. *Cyrril* hath written twelve Chapters which



which I thinke your holinesse knoweth, wherein he teacheth, *quia una est natura divinitatis & humanitatis* that there is one nature of the divinitie, and humanitie in Christ, these things are full of all impiety, and giving a reason hereof, he addeth, for the Church saith thus, as it hath beene taught from the Beginning, and confirmed therein by the doctrine of the most blessed Fathers; *Dua natura, una virtus, una persona, quod est unus filius, Domini noster Iesus Christus, Two natures, one power, one person, which is our Sonne our Lord Iesus Christ*: Thus *Ibas*: which words seeme to be so true, so orthodoxall and Catholike, that *Vigilius* and *Baronius*, might either be themselves hereby deceived, or, which I rather thinke, judge them, as they are indeed, a most colourable pretence to deceive others, & lead them into Nestorianisme: for no Catholike can possibly in fairer tearmes, or better for shew of words, expresse against *Nestorius* the true doctrine of the Catholike faith, then to say that there are two natures in Christ, and yet but one person. This seeing *Ibas* professeth in his Epistle, and withall accurseth<sup>b</sup> those who deny two natures in Christ, sure none can thinke but this was a fit text for *Vigilius* and *Baronius*, by it to commend this impious Epistle as orthodoxall & Catholike, wherein so Catholike a confession seemeth to bee made. But let us see how the Pope and the Cardinal descant on these words.

<sup>b</sup> Denunciavit ei ut anathematizaret eos qui dicunt quia una est natura divinitatis et humanitatis, Ibas in eadem Epist.

2. *Baronius* saith not much, but yet hee speakes plainly of this matter; The fathers at *Chalcedon*, saith he<sup>c</sup>, out of this Epistle of *Ibas*, gathered *Ibas* then (when he writ it) to be a Catholike, *ut pote quod ex eadem epistola demonstratur ipse*, because by this very Epistle *Ibas* was demonstrated, both to have held communion with *Cyrrill*, *execratusque esse unam naturam in Christo consentientes, confessum vero esse, naturas duas unam*<sup>d</sup> [personam] effecere, *Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum*, and also he was demonstrated by this Epistle, to have accursed those who confesse one onely nature in Christ, and to have confessed the two natures, to make one person, and Lord Iesus Christ. So *Baronius*: teaching not only that profession which *Ibas* makes in his Epistle, of two natures, and one person, to be Catholike; but that *Ibas* by that very confession is proved, nay demonstrated to be a Catholike.

<sup>c</sup> Bar. an. 448. nu. 75.

<sup>d</sup> Vox [personam] vitio Typographi deest apud Baron. sed ex Constructione Grammatica, et ipso sensu, necessariè addendam liquet.

3. *Vigilius* handles this matter farre more largely, but very obscurely & mystically, as being indeed so miserably intangled in the biddline of Nestorianisme, that hee knew not possibly how to unfold himselfe. I must first of all set downe his words, though they be many, and because they are very obscure, they will require more attentive, and serious ponderation; *Those things*, saith he<sup>e</sup>, *which in the Epistle of Ibas, are injuriously spoken against Cyrrill by a misunderstanding of Cyrrills sayings, the Fathers at Chalcedon, when they pronounced the Epistle to be orthodoxall, did not receive*, for the venerable Bishop (*Ibas*) himselfe by changing, refused those, when he had gotten better understanding of

<sup>e</sup> Vig. Const. an. 192.

Ibid. nu. 193.

of those Chapters which *Eunomius* in his interloquution doth most evidently declare. And the interloquution of *Iuvenalis* doth signifie the same, who therefore decreed that *Ibas* should receive his Bishopricke, as holding the orthodoxall profession of faith, because he devoutly ranne, to embrace the communion with *Cyrill*, after that *Cyrill* had explained his Chapters, and *Ibas* had understood them otherwise then before he did, though he had carped at *Cyrill*, when hee misunderstood those Chapters, for thus said *Iuvenalis*: The holy Scripture commandeth that he who is converted should be received, for which cause we receive such as returne from heretickes; wherefore I decree that the reverend *Ibas* should obtaine favour and receive his Bishopricke, both because he is an old man, and because he is a Catholike. So *Iuvenalis*: By which this is understood: If wee receive such as returne from heretikes, how should we not receive *Ibas* who is a Catholike? whom it is manifest to be a Catholike, seeing hee is now converted; from that understanding of *Cyrills* Chapters, whereby hee was deceived, who while hee doubted of the understanding of those Chapters, did seem to speak against *Cyrill*: for never would *Iuvenalis* say that *Ibas* were a Catholike, unlesse he had proved by the words of this Epistle his confession to bee orthodoxall. And that the Interloquutions of *Iuvenalis* and *Eunomius* doe agree, the words of *Eunomius* doe shew, which are these; In what things *Ibas* seemed to blame *Cyrill*, by speaking ill; hee hath refuted all those things which he blamed, by making a right confession at the last. By which words of *Eunomius* it is evidently declared, that in the confession of faith, made by *Ibas*, nothing was reproved, seeing it is manifest, that his faith was praised; and that *Ibas* hath refuted that, which by misunderstanding *Cyrill*, hee had thought amisse of him.

Ibid. nu. 194.

4. For the same venerable *Ibas*, by the precedent Acts, (as the judgement of *Photinus* and *Eustathius* doth shew) is most manifestly declared to receive and embrace all things which were done in the first Ephesine Synod, and judge them equall to the Nicene decrees, and to put no difference betwixt those and these at *Ephesus*: and *Eustathius* is shewed very much to commend the sanctity of *Ibas*, for that he was so ready and willing to cure those, who, either by suspition, or any other way did hurt the opinion of his learning: For after that *Cyrill* had explained his twelve Chapters, and the meaning which *Cyrill* had in them was declared unto *Ibas*, after that, *Ibas* professed himselfe, with all the Easterne Bishops, to have esteemed *Cyrill* a Catholike, and to have remained, even unto his end, in the communion with him; whence it is cleare, that *Ibas*, both before he understood the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*, and when hee suspected one (onely) nature of *Christ* to be taught and maintained by them, did then in an orthodoxal sense reject that which he thought to be spoken amisse in those Chapters; and also after the explanation thereof, did

did in an orthodoxall sense reverently embrace those things which he knew to be rightly spoken in those Chapters.

5. Further, <sup>h</sup> it doth without all doubt appeare to the minds of all the faithfull, that *Dioscorus* with *Eutiches*, did offer more wrong in the second Ephesine Synod, than *Ibas*, to *Cyrill* and the first Ephesine Councell, by understanding *Cyrills* Chapters in an hereticall sense, beleeving *Cyrill* to teach by his twelve Chapters *one* (onely) *nature in our Lord Iesus Christ*; and for this cause did *Dioscorus* condemne some of the Easterne Bishops, who would not acknowledge *one* (only) *nature in Christ*, among whom he condemned as an heretike, and deposed *Ibas* from his Bishopricke, specially for this very confession of his faith, wherein hee most plainly professeth *two natures, one power, one person, which is one Sonde, our Lord Iesus Christ*: and *Dioscorus* restored *Eutiches*, as a Catholike, for the confession of *one* (onely) *nature in Christ*, condemning also *Flavianus*, of blessed memory, for the same doctrine of holding *two natures*: And *Dioscorus* and *Eutiches* are found much more to indeavour to overthrow the first Ephesine Synod, while they defended it under the shew of an execrable sense, (*of one nature*) and to slander *Cyrill* more while they praise him, than did *Ibas*, when, by the error and misconceiving of *Cyrills* meaning, he dispraised him; for seeing their praise and dispraise doe tend unto the same thing, *Dioscorus* and *Eutiches*, who condemned *Cyrill*, are found to have commended him with an hereticall spirit, or in an hereticall sense, and therefore were they condemned in the Councell at *Chalcedon*; but *Ibas*, who at the first dispraised *Cyrills* Chapters, thinking *one* (onely) *nature* to be taught by them; and who, after the sense and meaning of them was declared unto him, did professe himselfe, with the Easterne Bishops, to communicate with *Cyrill*, was judged by the same Councell of *Chalcedon* to have continued in the right faith. Thus farre are the words of *Vigilius*, and so much of his Constitution as concernes this profession made by *Ibas*, of *two natures and one person in Christ*. <sup>h</sup> *Ibid. nu. 195.*

6. Words like the Oracles of *Apollo*, full of thick darknes, & hidde mysteries. Nor must you here expect any light at all from *Binius*; was wise enough to decline these rocks in the *Epist. of Ibas*, both that of the union with *Cyril*, this & of his confessing *two natures and one person*, at w<sup>ch</sup> feare to make shipwracke of faith, as *Vigilius* had done before, he thought it to be far the safest course at one stroke to wipe away and sponge out those whole passages both out of the Popes Constitution, and his owne Tomes of Councils: best to have them smothered in silence, or buried in eternall oblivion. Add yet, to say truth, had *Binius* used all his art in this point, that alas would but have helped a little, he, poore lambe, is not able of himselfe to wade, no nor through shallow places, it would require an Elephant to swimme through such a deepe: All his light is but borrowed of others, specially from *Barnabas*, where



where *Baronius* is silent, he is more mute than a fish: yea, and when some of the Cardinals beames doe happen to collustrate his notes, yet even there they lose a great part of that vigour which they have in the Cardinals Phoebean lampe.

7. The only man in the world fit to make a full and just commentary on this text of *Vigilius*, had beene *Baronius* himselfe: He by his long acquaintance with Popes, and Court of Rome, by his continuall rifling of the Vaticane Manuscripts, and anatomising so many Pontificall decrees, had quicke sense of the Popes pulse, he knew every string and straine in their breasts. But so unhappily it falls out, that the Cardinall himselfe durst not touch this soare; he passeth it over, nay, rather shuffles it from him with deepe silence; wote you why? you may bee sure hee knew there was a padde in this straw, which had the Cardinall uncovered, his owne friends could not have indured the lothsome sent of the Pontificall Constitution, but for very shame would have swept it out of the Church of God. Now because it were great pittie that so many mysteries as lye hid in this part of the Popes decree should be unknowne to the world, and because the very explication of the Popes words, is a full conviction of his heresie, for want of a better, I will lend them my best endeavours to supply the defect of the Cardinals Commentary in this point: And although all that I can say is, *nihil ad Parmenensis suum*, nothing to that which you should have applauded, *si ipsam belluam audissetis*, if the Popes commentator had beene himselfe pleased to write hereof; yet truly, by long contemplation of the Popes workes, and industrious observing the Cardinals *artificium* in explaining the like decrees, I well hope that I shal be able *dolare*, and after a rude fashion to rough-hew a peece of a commentary at this time; onely not being trained up in their Romane Schooles, where they learne to speake filken and sugered words of their Popes, and sow the softest Pillowes under their elbowes. I must crave pardon, if according to the Macedoniā rudenesse of our dialect I call a spade, a spade, a slander, a slander, and heresie, heresie, though it happen to be found even in his Holinesse himselfe, and in his Pontificall and *Cathedral* decree: In hope of which pardon (specially since the fault is so veniall) I will now addresse my selfe to an unaccustomed taske of making a Commentary upon the Popes writings.

8. The scope and purpose of *Vigilius* in this whole passage, is, to prove not onely *Ibas* himselfe, but his faith and profession also to have beene Catholike, not onely when he writ this *Epistle*, but ever since *Cyrril* explained his Chapters, and *Ibas* understood the same, which was before this *Epistle* was writ. And this appeares by the very words of *Vigilius*, who saith, that after *Cyrril*'s Chapters were explained, and understood by *Ibas*, *in communionem ejus devotè concurrerit*, he ranne, and hastened with devotion to embrace the communion with *Cyrril*, and having once embraced it,

it in<sup>h</sup> communione ipsius usque ad exitum permansisse, that he continu- k 7bid nu. 194.  
 ed in the same communion with Cyrill, even to the end of his life: and  
 as he was then a Catholike, so in this Epistle, which was writ  
 after Cyrills explanation, understood by him, hee expressed that  
 Catholike faith and profession, seeing<sup>l</sup> *Iuvenalis*, ex verbis *Epi-* l Ibid. nu. 193.  
*stola*, ejus confessionem fidei orthodoxam comprobavit, proved the confes-  
 sion of *Ibas* to be orthodoxall by the very words of this Epistle. This is  
 the purpose then of my author, to shew both *Ibas* and his confes-  
 sion offaith, when he writ this Epistle, to have beene Catholike:  
 To prove this he useth three principal reasons, the first is drawne  
 from the explanation of *Cyrills* Chapters, which *Ibas* devoutly  
 embraced; and this hee harps upon almost in every part of his  
 text, as you may easily see. The second is taken from his approba-  
 tion of the holy *Ephesine* Councel before *Photius* and *Eustathius*,  
 in these words; For the same venerable *Ibas*, &c. The third is  
 drawne from the very profession it selfe, and words thereof set  
 downe in the Epistle of *Ibas*, where he confesseth two natures, and  
 one person; and though there be a touch and taste of this through-  
 out the whole text, yet is it specially and more expresly set  
 downe in those words, Further, it doth without all doubt ap-  
 peare, &c. I must be inforced, for more perspicuities sake, to  
 invert the order of mine author, and begin with the exposition  
 of his third reason, because, if that be well understood, it will  
 serve for a torch to direct us in both the other.

9. In his third reason the Pope both affirms; and by divers  
 meanes proves that confession of *Ibas*, which in his Epistle hee  
 makes to bee orthodoxall, and before wee handle his proofes  
 hereof we must diligently consider the position it selfe, or con-  
 fession made by *Ibas*: *Ibas* his confession in his Epistle is, that  
 there are two natures, and one person in *Christ*: This confession in his  
 Epistle, saith *Vigilius* m, is orthodoxall; and for this was *Ibas* unjustly  
 condemned by *Dioscorus*, but justly commended by the Conncell at  
*Chalcedon*. I must set an unpleasant, but a very true and cer-  
 taine glosse upon these words, Both *Ibas*, and *Vigilius* commen-  
 ding him, and *Baronius* defending *Vigilius* herein, doe all Ne-  
 storianize; or, to speake more plainly, *Ibas* by that confession  
 in his Epistle teacheth, *Vigilius* by his *Cathedrall* decree confir-  
 meth, *Baronius* gnatonically applaudeth, and they all three con-  
 spire in defending the condemned heresie of *Nestorius*.

10. For the full manifestation whereof it must bee observed,  
 that the Nestorians, the more plausibly to convey their heresie,  
 wherein they denyed *Christ* the sonne of *Mary* to be God, used the  
 very same words altogether which Chatholikes did: As Catho-  
 likes said that there are two natures in *Christ*, the divinity, and the  
 humanity, so said the Nestorians also: As Catholikes confes-  
 sed *Christ* to be our Lord, so confessed the Nestorians likewise. In  
 words they both agreed and said the same, but in the sense and  
 meaning of those words they were quite contrary.

m Et ob hoc aliquos  
 Orientales Episco-  
 pos, qui unius natu-  
 ra predicationem  
 noluerunt suscipere  
 Dioscorum condem-  
 navit, inter quos et  
 Ibas, propter hanc  
 specialiter fidei ejus  
 professionem, qua  
 duas naturas, unam  
 virtutem, unam per-  
 sonam apertissime  
 confitetur, hereti-  
 cum condemnavit.  
 Vig. nu. 195.

11. When Catholikes said, that there are *two natures in Christ*, they meant truly & orthodoxally, that the divinity & humanity in Christ were differēt in essence and substance, & yet they both made but one *hypostasis*, that is, but one; and not *two subsistent persons*: But when the Nestorians said, that there are *two naturas in Christ*, they meant that either nature made a severall and distinct person by it selfe, and so they made Christ to be *two distinct persons*, each subsisting by it selfe, *two Sonnes, two Christs*, that is, in truth, *no Christ, no Saviour at all*; for a Saviour he cannot bee, unlesse the selfe same person which is man be God also.

12. Again, when Catholikes said, that *Christ is one person*, they meant truly and orthodoxally, that both natures together make but one personall subsistence, as the humane soule and body make but one person, or one man: but when the Nestorians said, that *Christ was one person*, they meant not of that unity which is by naturall or personall subsistence, but of *unity in affection, of unity by consent and liking, of unity by cohabitation*; the person of the Sonne of God, so affecting and liking the sonne of *Mary*, that it inhabited and dwelt therein, as in a holy temple or house; but yet, as neither the house is the inhabitant, nor the inhabitant the house, so neither was God (by their doctrine) the sonne of *Mary*, or man; nor yet was that man which was the sonne of *Mary*, God; but onely the house or temple of God.

13. When Catholikes called Iesus Christ *our Lord*, they meant truly and orthodoxally, that the man Iesus Christ, who tooke flesh of the Virgin *Mary*, is in truth very God, the God-head being hypostatically united unto the manhood, and both of them making but one person, who is both God and man: but the Nestorians in calling Iesus Christ *our Lord*, meant not that the man Christ was truly & personally God or Lord, but that he was God, and the Lord, onely by having God and the Lord inhabiting in him, and united, not personally, but onely affectually unto him; wherupon it followed, that they in adoring Christ, & giving divine honours unto him, were indeed *adoring God*; for they gave the honour proper onely to God, unto that person, or that mā, which, according to their doctrine, they held not to be God.

14. And, which of all may seeme most strange, whereas Catholikes not onely professed the Virgin *Mary* to be the Mother of God, but under those very tearmes, and by that forme of words, as being most easie and perspicuous, contradicted & condemned all the heresies of *Nestorians*, which were all by consequent included in their denying *Mary* to be *Dei mater*, the Mother of God; The Nestorians, to avoid the hatred of this speech, if they should deny it, and more plausibly to convey their heresie, said, and in words professed even this also, that *Mary was the Mother of God*; but they meant not thereby, as Catholikes did, that Christ, who tooke flesh of the Virgin *Mary*, was the same person or one personall subsistence with the Sonne of God, or, that God was incarnate;



incarnate, and assumed the manhood to make one person with the Godhead, but all that they meant was, that the Son of God, was onely by affection, and love united unto the sonne of *Marie*, being already perfect man in the wombe of his mother, and that God was borne of her, not by assuming flesh unto him, but by inhabiting that man who tooke flesh of her. Thus in shew of words the Nestorians seemed to bee Catholikes, and to say the same with Catholikes, but their sense and meaning in those words was most hereticall, and therefore indeed and in truth themselves notwithstanding all these speeches, were heretikes.

15. For the full and ample prooofe of all these, I must referre my selfe to another Treatise, if it ever happen to see the light: wherein I have at large handled this point, and proved another of their Popes somewhat more ancient then *Vigilius*, I meane *Hormisdas*, to have beene as deepe in the heresie of *Nestorius*, and to have as firmly by his Cathedrall and Apostolicall sentence confirmed the same, as *Vigilius* himselfe hath done, who as I thinke, by the example and authority of his predecessor was the more emboldned to plead for Nestorianisme, it being of all heresies which ever sprung up in the Church, most full of all sophistical subtillties, and colourable pretences of wit, was most fit of all the rest, to be commended by such as under the shew of learning, and truth, meant to defend and uphold heresie. But for this time I will now alleage onely a few evident testimonies, to declare the truth of that concurrence in words, and difference in sense, betweene Catholikes and Nestorians, which even now I mentioned.

16. *Nestorius* in his Epistle to *Alexander* signifying that the two natures in Christ are also two persons, saith thus; *Non duas personas unam personam facimus, we doe not make two persons, one person;* but by this one name of Christ, we signifie two natures (to wit, making two persons.) And to shew how these two persons are called by them one person; thou mayst, saith he, call him that was borne of *Mary*, by the name of the Sonne of God, for the Virgin which bare Christ, *filium Dei genuit, bare the Sonne of God*, but because the Sonne according to the Natures is double, *non genuit quidem filium Dei. she did not truly beare the Son of God* (as taking flesh from her) but she bare the man or humane nature, *qua propter filium adjunctum, filij quoque appellatione afficitur, which is called the Sonne of God, because the Sonne God is united and joynd unto him*: and in another place, He that was framed in the wombe, and laid in the grave, is not of himselfe God: *at quia Deus in homine assumpto existit, but because God is in the man whom hee assumes unto him*, the man assumed is called God, because hee is assumed of God. So *Nestorius*, plainly calling Christ, God, and the Son of God, and *Marie*, the mother of God, and yet denying God and man to be one person; but the person of God so assume a perfect man, or the person of Man.

n Extat in Conc. 3  
Coll. 6. pa 575. b.  
o Nestorij verba citata ibidem. pa. 576.  
a. & in Actis Conc. Ephef. 10. 2. ca. 8.  
fa. 747. a.  
p Negat Nestorius Mariam genuisse filium, ita ut ex ipsa carnem sumperit, affirmat genuisse, ita ut ex ipsa prodierit. Hoc declarat Nestorij verba apud Cyrillum citata in Epist. ad Acacium. 10. 3. Act. Ephef. ca. 7 ubi ita ait Nestorium; Deum ex Christipara virgine prodixisse ex divina scriptura edoctus sum, at vero Deum ex ipsa genitum esse (eo quo dixi sensu) id nesci quam edoctus sum.  
q Non per se & secundum se Deus est, quod in utero formatum est, non per se & secundum se Deus est, quod spiritus sancti opera effectum est, non per se & secundum se Deus est, quod in monumento conditum est. At quia Deus in homine assumptus existit, assumptus assumens, conjunctus, propter assumptum Deus appellatur. verba Nestorij citata in Act. Conc. Ephef. 10. 2. ca. 8. pa. 743. a.

r Theodori verba  
citata in Conc. 5.  
Coll. 4. pa. 528. a.

scoll. eadem. pa. 532.  
a. & Coll. 6. pa. 576.  
a.

17. *Theodorus* the master of *Nestorius* declares the same; in ipso *plasmato Deus verbum factus est*. The Word or Sonne of God was united to the man *Christ*, being framed and formed, shewing plainly that *Christ* was first made a perfect man, and person, and that then the Sonne of God as another person was united unto him. And shewing that the unity of the two natures is not personall, but onely affectuall; hee compares the unity which is betwixt the Godhead, and the manhood in *Christ*, to that unitie which is bewixt man and wife, who though they bee called one, yet are they in naturall subsistence two distinct persons. Even so saith he<sup>r</sup> in *Christ*, *non nocet naturarum differentia unitas personarum*, the unity of person doth not take away the distinction of the nature. And the two natures joyned together, *unam personam dicimus*, we call one person: which unity not to be personall no more then it is in man and wife; but affectuall, hee immediately explaneth, expressly affirming either nature in *Christ*, to be a perfect and distinct person, or personall subsistence by it selfe, saying, for when we discern or teach two natures, *perfectam naturam verbi Dei dicimus & perfectam personam, perfectam autem & hominis naturam & personam similiter*: we affirme both the perfect nature, and the perfect person of the Sonne of God, and also the perfect nature, and perfect person of man to be in *Christ*: but when we look at the conjunction of these (natures) *unam personam tunc dicimus*, then wee call them one person, (to wit one by affectuall, but not by naturall and personall unity, for he said plainly before, that they were two perfect distinct persons.) Thus *Theodorus*.

r Edit. 7. p. 57. S.  
Credimus autem.

u Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa.  
575. b.

18. This is to have beene the very true meaning of the Nestorians, *Iustinian* in his Edict manifestly declareth, writing thus and most divinely; In<sup>t</sup> that the Apostle saith of the Sonne of God, that he tooke the forme of a servant, he sheweth that the Word was united to the Nature of Man: but not to any subsistence or person: for he doth not say; he tooke him, who was in the forme of a servant, least he should imply thereby, that the Word was united unto the man being formerly formed, as impious *Theodorus* and *Nestorius* did blaspheme: *affectualem dicentes unitatem*, teaching an affectuall (and no personall) unitie betwixt them. The fifth Councell after most exact sifting of this matter doth witnes the same, writing thus; *Theodorus* and *Nestorius* teaching two persons, two *Christs*, two sonnes, would hide their impietie by calling them two natures, and one sonne. And a little after, *Theodorus affectualem unitatem dicens, naturas pro personis & subsistentijs accipit*. *Theodorus* teaching an affectuall union (onely) to bee betwixt the two natures, useth the word Nature for Person: and so indeed teacheth two persons; *Quomodo Nestorius duas dicit naturas: in which same sense also Nestorius teacheth two natures to be in Christ: sed pro personis eas accipit, but hee taketh those two natures for two persons*. So the generall Councell.

19. Pope *Iohn* the second, doth clearly expresse this, setting downe

downe the faith of the Romane Church. Wee \* professe Christ to be perfect in deity, and perfect in the humanity: non antea existente carne, & postea unita verbo, sed in ipso Deo verbo initium ut esset accipiens, his flesh; (or humane nature) not first existing; and then the Word being united unto it: but his flesh taking beginning in the very Word: nec duas personas in Christo intelligimus: neither doe wee understand two persons to be in Christ, when wee say two natures to be in him, as made Nestorius thought. Thus the Pope. But no where is this more clearly and fully explained then in the Dialogue of Maxentius, where the Catholike disputing with the Nestorian, saith thus: This is the cause of your error, you cannot discern the difference betwixt Person and Nature: But understanding Nature to be all one with Person, ye confound (or use for one and the same thing) these two: & duas omnino personas, sicut duas naturas unus filij Dei sine dubio predicatis: and without all doubt, you teach two persons to be in the Sonne of God, when yee professe two natures to be in him.

20. By this which I have sayd, it is now evident, that the Nestorians spake like Catholikes, but they thought contrarie to Catholikes: their words were holy and orthodoxall, but their sense, and meaning, was blasphemous, and hereticall. Neither was this any new policie of the Nestorians; The Arians, the Pelagians, almost all heretikes, have practised the like: out of them all, I will here alleage but one example. Vitalis \* a Presbyter of Antioch, was accused unto Damasus to maintaine in some part the heresie of Apollinaris, as denying Christ to have a soule or minde; At the motion \* of Damasus, he delivered in writing a confession of his faith. In that confession, disertis verbis confessus est in Christo, sicut carnem ita & mentem<sup>b</sup>: hee in plaine termes professed Christ to have as well a soule as a body. This his confession seeming at the first to be sound \* and good, was approved for catholike, both by Pope Damasus, by Gregorie Nazianzen and other Catholikes, who suspected no hereticall fraud to lye hid under such faire and orthodoxall words, for in his confession of faith, Scriptura<sup>d</sup> verba sine ulla depravatione collocabat; nihil prorsus immutans, nec orationis seriem adulterans: Vitalis had placed the very words of the Scripture; not depraved, not any way changed, neither the order, nor writing of them being corrupted. But when Vitalis \* came among his owne fellowes, to whom he opened his secret meaning and his fraud, as the Manichees were wont to do among their electi, he then told them, That by the soule<sup>e</sup> and mind which hee had acknowledged in Christ, he meant nothing but the very Deity it selfe; which unto Christs body, was as the soule & mind, to animate it with life, sense, and reason, which was one part of the heresie of Apollinaris. As soones as Pope Damasus, and Gregory Nazianzen knew of this fraud, they not onely rejected Vitalis out of their communion, but condemned as hereticall, and that also with an Anathema denounced against ir, Fidei

x Job. 2. Epist. 37 ad  
Separate.  
y Job. Maxent. Dial.  
1 ca. 12.

z Elias Cretens. in  
Greg. Nazian. Epi.  
2. ad Clidon.

a Poscente illo (Damasus) ut fidem suam  
exponeret, eam scriptis  
ma. datam edidit.  
ibid.

b Baron. an. 373.

nu. 3.

c Prima fronte recta  
& sana visa (ea  
professio) idcirco &  
Damasus & hic di-  
vinitus magister (Gre-  
gorius) eam admisse-  
runt, quod abditam  
& occultam fraudem  
nullo modo depre-  
hendissent, nec ver-  
sutam malignitatem  
sub verbis latentem.

Elias Cret. loc. cit.

d Elias Cret. ibid.

e Hi cum discipulis  
suis abditam & mys-  
ticam, de absconditis  
theologicis insitil-  
lant sermonem,

quemadmodum &  
Manichei, totam dis-  
sertum revelantes.

Greg. Nazian. Epist.

2. ad Clidon.

f Animam & rati-

onem ac mentem,

(Christi) divinitatem

ipsam introdu-

cunt, tanquam ipsa

sola carnis sit anima

mentem divinitatem

tem Christi dicentes.

Greg. ibid.

g Statim ac dolum

sensit, fraudu-

lentum hominem ab

ecclesia prohibuit.

Elias Cret. loc. cit.



*h* Ne nos accusent  
quod Vitalis fidem  
prius quidem proba-  
verimus, nunc vero  
repudiamus. Greg.  
Naz. Epist. 2. ad Cli-  
don. & similia habet  
in Epist. 2. ad Holo-

*libellum*, that very same profession of faith made by *Vitalis*, which themselves before had approved, which *sa& Gregorie*<sup>h</sup> defendeth as just and right, both for himselfe, and for *Damasus*.

21. From this, two things are specially for our present purpose to be observed. The former, that an hereticall profession may bee made in most orthodoxall termes, yea in the very words of the holy Scripture, not corrupted, not altered, not changed, for so was this hereticall confession of *Vitalis*. The other is, that the selfe same profession of faith, if wee looke onely at the words, may be allowed for orthodoxall, when the sense thereof is and appeareth to bee orthodoxall, and when there is no evidence to the contrary, but that the party who makes that profession, as he speakes orthodoxally, so also meaneth orthodoxally: and that same profession also, may justly bee condemned for hereticall, when by any overt act, or outward evidence, it doth certainly appeare, that the party who made that confession, by, and under those orthodoxall words, meant by a fraudulent, and equivocating collusion, to expresse an hereticall sense: for while there appeared no cause to mistrust *Vitalis*, Pope *Damasus* and others approved his profession, as orthodoxall: but as soone as they knew hee meant heretically they condemned, and anathematized, the very selfe same profession as hereticall. The reason of all which is, that which the same *Gregorie*<sup>i</sup>, and after him *Iustinian*<sup>k</sup> expresseth, *quoniam eadem voces, because the very same words*, if they bee rightly expounded, and understood, are pious, but if they be taken in an hereticall sense, they are impious.

22. That which *Damasus* and *Gregorie* did in the confession of *Vitalis*, must bee done in the profession of the Nestorians: when Catholikes say there are in Christ *two natures, and one person*, their confession is orthodoxall, because they say it in an orthodoxall sense, using the words as they ought to bee in their right, naturall, and usuall signification: But when the Nestorians say the very same words, their saying is hereticall, because they say it in an hereticall sense, abusing the words, to an equivocall, unnaturall, and unusuall signification. Nay, it not onely must, but it was sayd, it was decreed in this very case of *Nestorius*, and that by the whole generall Councell at *Ephesus*, themselves being Catholikes professed in Christ, *two natures, and one person*, and yet they condemned<sup>l</sup> and accursed *Nestorius*, who in words said the very same, acknowledging in Christ *two natures, and one person*. Whose judgement herein being followed both by the Councell at *Chalcedon*, & this 5. Synod, & in a word, by the whole Catholike Church, is a warrant authentically, that a profession being for words, one, and the selfe same, may and ought in some to be judged orthodoxall, & in others condemned as hereticall, and the saying of old *Ennius*<sup>m</sup> though spoken to another purpose, is verified in this, *Eadem dicta, eademque oratio aqua non aque valet*.

23. It

*j* Greg. Epist. 2. ad  
Clid.  
*k* Iust. in Edict.  
*l* S. Tali.

*l* Nestorium duas  
quidem naturas, et  
unam personam di-  
centem Ephesina  
prima Synodus  
condemnavit. Iust.  
in Edict. S. Tali.

*m* Ennius Gal. lib. 11.  
1. 4.

23. It is not enough then to prove either *Ibas* to be a Catholike, or his *Epistle* orthodoxall, because in it *Ibas* professeth two natures, and one person in Christ, (for *Theodorus*, and *Nestorius* professed the very same) but the sense and meaning of his words, set downe in that *Epistle*, must be exactly considered, whether he meant not as other Nestorians, and even as *Nestorius* himselfe did, two such natures, as make two distinct persons also, and whether he called them not one person, in such a sense, as meaning that they were one, not by naturall, or personall subsistence, but onely by affection, and cohabitation. If it may appeare that this was indeed the meaning of *Ibas* in his *Epistle*, then will those words of his profession, be so farre from proving either him or his *Epistle* to be Catholike, as *Vigilius* and *Baronius* doe thence inferre, that it will demonstrate both *Ibas* in making that profession, and *Vigilius* and *Baronius* in defending it, to approve and maintaine Nestorianisme as the onely Catholike Faith.

24. But can this thinke you be shewed indeed? It may: and that most clearly, and most certainly. The Emperour *Iustinian* in his religious Edict both testifieth and demonstrates this. Heretickes, saith he <sup>n</sup>, *omitting other blasphemies in this Epistle of Ibas, alludge this onely, which the Author of that Epistle spake to beguile the simple thereby, in that he professeth duas naturas, unam virtutē, unā personā, two natures, one power, one person, which we our selves also doe confesse. Sed certum est, quod unicuique natura suam personam attribuit; but it is certaine, that the Author of that Epistle (Ibas) doth attribute to eyther nature a severall person, even as doe Theodorus and Nestorius, whom this Writer doth defend: For, they plainly teaching two natures of the Word of God, or of Christ, whom they esteeme to be no more then a man, doe call them (those two natures) one person, per affectualem conjunctionem, by an affectuall conjunction, and as having one dignity, and one honour. And it is cleere that the writer of this Epistle, saying that there is one vertue, and one power of the two natures; doth herein follow the foresaid heretickes, Theodorus in his impious booke of the incarnation, and Nestorius in many of his writings, but specially in his Epistle to Alexander; where he saith that there is one authoritie, one vertue, one power, one person; in respect of dignitie and honour due unto them, whereby it is declared that the author of this Epistle, did according to their perfidious impiety, use vocabulo naturarum pro personis, this word Natures, for Persons: for one authoritie, one power, one dignity and honour, non in diversis naturis, sed in diversis personis dicitur, is not said to bee in divers natures, but in divers persons, of the same nature, as in the Trinitie we professe. Thus Iustinian both truly, and profoundly.*

25. The fift generall Councell witnesseth the same, and almost in the same words. The author (say they) of this Epistle, seacheth

n Edict. Iust. 5. Titl

o Con. 5. Coll. 6. p. 575.

teacheth two natures, one vertue, one person, one sonne. Sed certum est quod pro personis naturas ponit, & affectualem unitatem dicit, but it is certaine that he taketh the name of natures, for persons, and understandeth an affectuall unitie, even as doe Theodorus, and Nestorius, whom this writer doth defend and praise: Thus both the Emperour and the whole generall approved Councell, witnesse Ibas to meane by two natures, two persons, and by one person, one by affectuall, not by personall unitie, and they witnesse this not as a thing doubtfull, or uncertaine; but they seale it with a *Certum est, this is certaine*,

26. The *Epistle* it selfe doth so abundantly declare this truth, that none I thinke but a Nestorian, can make any doubt there. Of *Marius* to whom Ibas writ this was a Nestorian herericke: The end of his writing was to confirme, both *Marius* and the rest of that sect in their heresie. Had Ibas writ this touching two natures, and one person, in an orthodoxall sense, he had utterly condemned that same doctrine, which he purposely commendeth; he had overthrowne Nestorianisme, which he by this *Epistle*, meant to establish. Againe, how could hee have condemned *Cyrril* or the Ephesine Councell as hereticall, had he beleev'd the two natures to be personally united in Christ? for that is the selfe same which *Cyrril*, and the Councell defendeth. Or how could he have commended *Theodorus*, for a teacher of the truth, who denies the personall, and holds onely an affectuall unitie of those two natures, had Ibas meant that there had beene a true personall and Hypostaticall union of them? Take the words in the Nestorian sense, there is a perfect harmonie in the whole *Epistle*: take them in the orthodoxall sense, the beginning will then jarre from the middle and end, this makes a discord in the whole writing, yea, it makes the profession of Ibas to fight with the maine scope and purpose of Ibas.

27. That one place in the end of the *Epistle*, concerning the union, maketh this most evident. Ibas saith that among other things *Paulus Emisenus* required, and *Cyrril* consented to anathematize those who professe, *quia una natura est divinitatis, & humanitatis*; that there is one nature of the deitie and humanitie in Christ. Had Ibas by one nature, meant one essence, so that both the humanitie, and deitie were one essence, why should they require *Cyrril* to anathematize that? for neither *Cyrril*, nor any Catholike ever affirmed there was onely one nature, that is, one onely essence in Christ. But by nature, Ibas understood Person; and so its true that *Cyrril* taught one nature, that is, one onely person in Christ; whereas *Nestorian*, Ibas and all the Nestorians affirmed two such Natures, that is, two persons to be in Christ: according to which sense, Ibas saith, that *Paulus* dealing with *Cyrril* to yeeld to Nestorianisme, and on the behalfe of the Nestorians, required him to anathematize those who say there is but one Nature, that is, but one person in Christ: and he slanderously adds, that *Cyrril* consented



consented so to do: that is, that he subscribed indeed to all Nestorianisme, and renounced the Catholike faith, the decree of the Ephesine Councell, and his owne twelve Chapters. In which slanderous report *Ibas* insulting saith, *Non enim quisquam audeat dicere quia una est natura*, None dare now say that there is one nature of the divinitie and humanitie, one nature, that is, one essence: no Catholike then, or ever, did say, but none dare now say, that there is one Nature, that is, one person in Christ, which all Catholikes both then, and ever said, and this the very next words doe declare; but now they doe professe to beleeve in templum, & in eum qui in hoc habitat, in the temple, and in him who dwelleth in the temple, which was the very comparison of Nestorius, to expresse that the two natures in Christ, are two persons, as are the house and inhabitants, and one not by personall, but onely by affectionall unitie and cohabitation. So cleere it is that *Ibas* by his confessing of two natures meant two persons, and by confessing one person, meant one by affection, but not by personall union: that is, meant all in an hereticall, and Nestorian sense; and nothing in the true Catholike, and orthodoxall meaning.

28. But what seeke I further prooffe of this matter, seeing the fifth Councell, approved by the whole catholike Church, hath defined the whole <sup>9</sup> Epistle to bee hereticall, accusing every one who defendeth it, or any part of it. An undeniable prooffe, not onely that the profession of *Ibas* made therein of two natures and one person, is hereticall, but that *Vigilius* and *Baronius*, for this very point are anathematized by the whole Church, because they defend that profession in this Epistle as Catholike and orthodoxall, which by so many, so evident demonstrations, and even by the consenting judgement of the whole Church, is condemned for hereticall: And this I hope may suffice to explaine or illustrate the Popes meaning in the Position or conclusion which he undertakes to prove in his reason, that *Ibas* was a Catholike, in making this so orthodoxall; and Catholike a profession in his Epistle, of two natures and one person.

29. Let us now come unto the reasons, whereby our Author *Vigilius* proves this profession to be Catholike. Those are specially three, in which, because they all depend on that which hath beene declared in the position, we may be the more briefe. The first is, because *Dioscorus*, and the Ephesine Lawe did judge both this profession of *Ibas*, and *Ibas* himselfe for making this profession, to bee hereticall, propter hanc fidei professionem, for this profession of two natures and one person, he condemned and deposed *Ibas*. Now the judgement of *Dioscorus* to have beene unjust, and hereticall there is no doubt, and therefore the confession of *Ibas* which hee condemned must be acknowledged as orthodoxall, and Catholike, as being repugnant to the hereticall doctrine of *Dioscorus*. A very poore and silly collection for a

Pope:

p Si quis dixerit  
Christum Deum ve-  
rum esse, & non po-  
tius nobiscum deum;  
hoc est, inhabitasse  
naturam nostram per  
id quod unitus est  
nostra, anathema sit,  
Nestorius in anathema-  
tismo 1. contra Cy-  
rill. anath. §. 1. in  
Añ. Conc. Eph. 2. o.  
ca. 5. in Appen. pa.  
768.

q Tota Epistola he-  
retica est, Epistola  
per omnia contraria  
est definitioni a Sy-  
nodo Chalced. facta.  
Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa.  
576. a. b.

r Dioscorus Ibas  
propter hanc specia-  
liter fidei professio-  
nem qua duas natu-  
ras, unam virtutem,  
unam personam a-  
pertissime confite-  
tur, hereticum con-  
denavit. Const. Vig.  
nu. 195.

r Eutiches dixit, cō-  
fitemur ex duabus  
naturis fuisse domi-  
num nostrum ante  
adunationē, post ve-  
ro adunationē unam  
naturam confiteor.  
Dioscorus & Syno-  
dus (Ephesine 2.)  
dixit, consentimus  
huic & nos omnes.  
Act. Conc. Ephes-  
recitata in Conc.  
Chal. Act. 1. p. 28. b.

Pope: and I doubt not but *Vigilius* would have derided it, had not Nestorianisme at this time bereft him of all sound reason and judgement. *Dioscorus* and his Ephesine conspiracie maintained the heresie of *Eutiches*, which denieth two natures at all, or any way either making one or two persons, to be in Christ after the incarnation. So whether one held the same two natures, to make but one person, as the Catholikes said, or to make two distinct persons as the Nestorians affirmed, it was all one to *Dioscorus*; The very holding of two natures to be in Christ, either of those wayes made one an hereticke in the judgement of *Eutiches*, *Dioscorus*, and their Ephesine Synod. The heresie of *Eutiches* did equally contradict both the Catholike truth and the Nestorian heresie, because they both consented in one common truth, that there are two distinct natures, or essences abiding in Christ. If this judgement of *Dioscorus* against *Ibas*, will prove either him or his *Epistle* to be Catholike, the very like effect it must have in *Theodorus*, in *Nestorius*, in all Nestorians, and in all their writings; they all with *Ibas* professe two natures to abide in Christ, they all by the judgement of *Dioscorus* and his Synod, are hereticall. So either must *Vigilius* approve all Nestorians for Catholikes, if this reason for *Ibas* be effectually, or if they be truly hereticke, whom *Dioscorus* yet hath condemned, as well as *Ibas*, then is this his reason ineffectually to prove from the condemnation of *Dioscorus*, *Ibas* or his profession to be Catholike.

(*Vigil. Const. nu.*  
195.

30. His second reason is drawne from the likenesse and identitie of faith in *Flavianus* and *Ibas*, *damnat quoque propter duarum naturarum vocem*, *Dioscorus* did also, or for the same cause, condemne *Flavianus*, for which *Ibas* was condemned, to wit, for professing two natures in Christ. Seeing then it is knowne, that the profession of *Flavianus* was Catholike, the profession also of *Ibas* made in this *Epistle*, being like to that of *Flavianus*, must needs be Catholike; My annotation on this reason of *Vigilius* is, that it is inconsequent, sophisticall, and worth nothing at all, *Ibas* indeede in words said the like with *Flavianus*, but *Flavianus* said it in a Catholike sense, holding those two natures to make but one person or personall subsistence, and *Ibas* said it in this *Epistle* in an hereticall sense, holding those two natures to make two distinct persons, or two personall subsistences. To *Dioscorus* it was all one to say as *Flavianus* did, or as *Ibas* in this *Epistle* doth; for seeing they both jumpe in this, that two natures or essences doe remaine after the incarnation, they are both alike hereticke to *Dioscorus*, though in truth the profession of *Flavianus* made him a Martyr, and the profession of *Ibas*, set down in this *Epistle*, being in words the same, make him an hereticke. Or if *Ibas* be a Catholike for professing in words the same which *Flavianus* did, then by this reason of our Author *Vigilius*, *Theodorus*, *Nestorius*, and all the Nestorians, are Catholikes, be-  
cause

cause they all professe with *Flavianus*, two natures, and one person to be in *Christ* in the same manner as *Ibas* here doth.

31. His third and last reason is drawne from the judgement of the Councell at *Chalcedon*; they condemned *Dioscorus* and *Eutiches*, but they embraced *Ibas*: an evidence, that as they judged the profession of *Dioscorus* to be hereticall, so they esteemed the profession of *Ibas* to be orthodoxall; yea, even this which he maketh in this *Epistle*; for after that *Cyrill* had once explained his Chapters, which was before this *Epistle* was writ, after that time, in *Catholica fidei rectitudine ab eadem Chalcedonenſi Synodo judicatus eſt Ibas permansisse*; *Ibas* was by the Synod at *Chalcedon* judged to have continued in the right profession of the faith. The only glosse fit for this reason is, that it is fallacious, untrue, and slanderous: fallacious; for the Councell of *Chalcedon* received *Ibas* indeed, but not for this profession made in his *Epistle*; which that holy Councell both knew, and condemned as hereticall, but, as before we have declared, for his consenting to the *Ephesine* Councell; and condemning of *Nestorius* first before *Photius*, & *Eustathius*, & before then themselves in the Councell at *Chalcedon*; upon this, whereby *Ibas* did intruth condemne his owne profession made in this *Epistle*, and this whole *Epistle*, upon this I say; and not for professing in this *Epistle* two natures and one person, was *Ibas* received by the Councell at *Chalcedon*: untrue; for neither did the Councell of *Chalcedon* judge *Ibas* to have bene a Catholike, or hold the *Catholike* faith, upon the declaration of *Cyril's* Chapters; much lesse did they judge him to have continued ever after that time, in the orthodoxie of faith: slanderous; for *Vigilius* by saying that the Councell of *Chalcedon* held *Ibas* for a Catholike, upon, or shortly after the declaration of *Cyril's* Chapters, makes them all guilty of Nestorianisme: long after that explanation did *Ibas* write this *Epistle*, wherein all the blasphemies of *Nestorius*, are maintained. Had they judged him, since that Explanation to be a Catholike; they must approve this *Epistle* for Catholike, and so prove themselves to be hereticall; to be Nestorians. Thus *Vigilius*, to cloake his owne heresie, would faine fasten it upon the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, which was so farre from partaking with *Vigilius* herein, that by their definitive sentence this very "professio of two natures, and one person, made in this *Epistle*; yea, every part of this *Epistle*, is condemned for impious, and hereticall. And this I hope may serve for an explanation of Pope *Vigilius*: his third reason to prove *Ibas* a Catholike, (drawne from this profession of faith, made in this *Epistle*) untill some Annalist like *Baronius* will helpe us to a better Commentary.

32. The second reason of *Vigilius*, set downe in the words before recited to prove *Ibas* a Catholike; is drawne from his approving of the *Ephesine* Councell at the judgement before *Photius* & *Eustathius*; He there, saith *Vigilius*, most plainly approved

*Vig. Const. nu. 195*

*u Tota Epistola heretica est. Cons. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 576. a. b.*

*z In Const. nu. 194.*



ved the Ephesine Synod, and the doctrines decreed therein, he professed them to be equall to the Nicene decrees; Photius the Iudge, exceedingly commended Ibas, that hee was so forward to professe the true faith, and wipe away all suspicion of heresie from him: how could Ibas then be ought else but a Catholike, who made such a Catholike confession? Truly when Ibas made this confession before Photius and Eustathius, there is no doubt but he was then a Catholike; but Vigilinus his purpose is to prove him to have beene a Catholike, when he writ this Epistle, ever since the time that Cyrill explained his Chapters; and Baronius, who is very sparing of his speech in this whole matter, yet both saw, and professeth this to be the true intent of Vigilinus; for he telling us, that whereas those words in the end of the Epistle of Ibas, [None dare now say, there is one nature, but they professe to beleieve in the Temple, and in him who dwelleth in the Temple] were wont to be taken by the Nestorians in such a sense, as if in Christ there were two persons, *ne Ibas putaretur ejusdem esse in verbis illis sententia cum Nestorianis*, lest Ibas might be thought to have the same meaning with the Nestorians in those words; Vigilinus bringeth a declaration of those words, how they are to be brought to a right sense, and this he teacheth, by shewing how Ibas in the Acts (before Photius and Eustathius) embraced the Ephesine Councell. So Baronius: by whose helpe, besides the evidence in the text it selfe; it now appeares, that Vigilinus, by this profession of Ibas, made before Photius and Eustathius, would prove Ibas to have beene a Catholike when hee writ this Epistle, and that in it Ibas was not *eiusdem sententia cum Nestorianis*, of the same opinion with the Nestorians.

33. A reason so void of reason, that I could not have held patience with the Popes Holinesse, had not Nestorianisme dulled his wit and judgement at this time. The judgement before Photius and Eustathius, was in the yeare when Posthumianus and Zeno were Consuls, or in the next unto it, as the Acts<sup>a</sup> do testifie, that is, according to Baronius account, *an. 448*. The union<sup>b</sup> betwixt Iohn and Cyrill was made in the next yeare after the Ephesine Councell, that is, *an. 432*. The Epistle of Ibas was writ by Baronius Almanacke in the very moment of the union; but in truth, two or three yeares at the least after the union, as before we have proved. Now I pray you, what a consequent, or collection call you this? Ibas being suspected of Nestorianisme, to cleare himselfe, consented to the Ephesine Councell, and shewed himselfe to bee a Catholike, sixteene yeares after the union, or thirteene yeares after he writ this Epistle: therefore at the time of the union, and of the writing of this Epistle, he was a Catholike also, and not a Nestorian. Why, twelve or sixteen yeares might have a strange operatiō in Ibas; and there is no doubt but so it had? In so many revolutions Ibas saw, how both himselfe and other Nestorians were publikely cōdemned by the Church, and by the Emperour, and hated of all, who had any love to the Catholike

<sup>x</sup> In Capitulis à Cyrillo explanatis, deoatē in ejus communionem concurre. Vig. Const. nu. 193. post explanationem 12. Capitulum Ibas professus esse habuisse Cyrillum orthodoxum, et in cōmunionem ipsius ad exitum permansisse. Ibid. nu. 194.  
<sup>y</sup> Bar. an. 553. nu. 193.

<sup>x</sup> Iudicium illud Photij, et Eustathij extat cum Actis in eo, in Conc. Chal. Act. 9. et 10.  
<sup>a</sup> Bar. illo an. nu. 57  
<sup>b</sup> Vt supra probatum est. Ca. 11.

Catholike faith: He saw that himselfe was personally called *corā nobis*, for maintaining that heresie: he knew, that unlesse hee cleared himselfe before those Iudges, deputed by the Emperour to heare and examine his cause; he was in danger of the like deprivation, as *Nestorius*, and some others had justly felt. The serious and often meditation of these matters wrought effectually upon *Ibas*, and therefore before *Photius* & *Eusebii* he renounced, disclaimed, and condemned Nestorianisme, and so at that time proved himselfe, by his profession before them, to bee a Catholike, as he had before that time, and specially when he writ this *Epistle*, demonstrated himselfe to be, not onely an earnest, but a malicious and slanderous heretike. I cannot illustrate the Pope, my Authors reason, by a more fit similitude, than of a man once deadly sicke of the Pestilence, but afterwards fully cured and amended; for *Vigilius* his reason is, as if one should say, This man was not sicke of the Pestilence, no nor when the sore was running upon him, and hee at the very point of death, because some twelve or sixteene yeares after, hee was a sound man, cleare from all suspition of the Pestilence. Nor needeth this second reason of *Vigilius* any further explanation.

34. We come now, in the last place, to that which *Vigilius* maketh his first reason in the former text; into which, because hee hath compacted the very venome of the Nestorians, wee must bee enforced to take somewhat the more paines, in our Commentary upon it. This reason (in which, it seems, the Pope puts his greatest confidence) is drawne from the explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, of which *Vigilius* saith, that *Ibas* at the first, & before *Cyrill* had explaned them, misconceived the meaning of *Cyrill*, and therefore seemed to speake against *Cyrill*: but so soone as *Cyrill* had explaned them, and decared his owne meaning, then *Ibas*, and all the Easterne Bishops forthwith embraced the communion with *Cyrill*, and ever after that, *Ibas* continued a Catholike. This *Epistle* then of *Ibas*, and profession of faith made therein, which certainly followed the Explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, must needs be Catholike, & declare *Ibas*, whē he writ it, to have been a Catholike; seeing, when he made this confession of faith, and writ this *Epistle*, he held the same faith with *Cyrill*, and therefore no doubt held the Catholike faith. This is the full summe and effect of the Popes reason, taken from the Explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, and for the excellency of it, it spreadeth it selfe into every part of the two other reasons also, as containing an explication of them, or giving strength unto them; for which cause wee are with more diligence and circumspection to examine the pith of it.

35. And that we may more clearely behold and admire the Popes *Artificium*, in handling this reason, we are to observe five severall points thereof. The first, a peece of the Popes Rhetoricke, in that he saith <sup>d</sup> that *Ibas* before the Explanation and

c *Vig. Const. nu. 193*  
193, 194.

d *Nu. 193.*

union,

e Donec seipsum interpretatus fuisset, quia Orientale Concilium eum vocabat hereticum, et ut hereticum condemnavit, hereticum eum et ego putavi. verba Ibe, in Act. Conc. Chal. Act. 10. pa. 113. a.

f Quando Orientale Concilium eum, quasi hereticum anathematizavit, sequutus sum primatem meum: verba Ibe, ibid. pa. 112. b.

h Ita Cyrillum vocatum à Concilio ubi lo Tobannis, supra ostendi ca. 11.

i Et juravimus quod Cyrillus, etiamsi rejecerit Capitula, à nobis suscipiendus non sit, eo quod Heryarches factus sit. Epist. Legatorum Concilii Ephesini, 10. 3. Act. ca. 10. Append.

k Vig. Const. nu. 193.

l Ibid. nu. 194.

m Ibid. et in Catholica fidei reformatione iudicatus est permansisse. 24. 195.

n Epistola illa Theod. extat in Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 558. b.

union, whilst hee doubted, and misconceived the meaning of Cyrill, *visus est ei obloqui*, he seemed to speake against Cyrill at that time. He seemed: Now *Ibas* professeth of himselfe, that hee then called \* *Cyrill* an hereticke, that hee followed *Iohn*<sup>f</sup>, and the Conventicle, which held with him, and so that with them hee counted, and in plain terms, called *Cyrill*<sup>h</sup> an author of schisme, a disturber of the peace of the Church, a despiser of imperiall authoritie, an upholder of open tyrannie, an Arch-hereticke, and chiefe of the conspiracie, that he condemned, accursed, anathematized him, and that with such a detestation, that though *Cyrill*<sup>i</sup> should disclaime his heresie, yet hee should never be received into their communion. These and many like intolerable calumnies, and slanders, were the usuall liveries, that *Ibas* and the rest of that Conventicle, during the time of the disunion bestowed upon *Cyrill*, so vile, and malicious, that no hyperbolicall exaggeration, can sufficiently expresse the impietie of them, and yet the Popes holinessse, by the figure called *Meiosis*, doth so artificially extenuate, and almost annihilate them, as if in all these, *Ibas* did but seeme to speake against *Cyrill*, He seemed, what, to revile? nay, he seemed but to speake against him: *Vigilius* was too sparing and diminutive in his reproofe, *Non laudo*.

36. The second part of his *Artificium* concernes Chronology, where he<sup>k</sup> saith, that when *Cyrill* had explained his Chapters, *Ibas* in *eius communionem* devote concurrat, *Ibas* then ran, and hastened to communicate with *Cyril*. Nor did *Ibas* alone at that time accord with *Cyrill*, but he, cum<sup>l</sup> omnibus Orientalibus Episcopis, with all the Easterne Bishops, they all then embraced *Cyrill* for a Catholike; and *Ibas* ever after that, usque ad exitum, even to his dying day, continued in the Catholike communion with *Cyrill*. Thus *Vigilius*. I cannot flatter the Pope, nor set any glosse upon this text, but this, that is utterly untrue. All the Easterne Bishops did not, at the time of the union betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, much lesse at the time when *Cyrill* declared his Chapters, consent, or hold communion with *Cyrill*. Of *Theodoret* it is as evident as the Sun, for he, after the union, writ<sup>m</sup> to *Nestorius*, that he then held *Cyrills* Chapters hereticall, and that hee would not consent to that which was done against *Nestorius*, no, not though his hands should be cut off. The like is certaine of *Ibas*, for that hee continued a malicious and slanderous defender of Nestorianisme, after the union; this, his impious *Epistle*, written, at least, two whole yeares after that union, wherein he maintaineth all the impieties of *Nestorius*, doth demonstrate. So untrue it is which *Vigilius* affirmeth, both in generall, that all the Easterne Bishops, and particularly, that *Ibas*, upon the Explanation of *Cyrills* Chapters, which was before the union, consented to *Cyrill*, and communicated with him: and much more untrue it is, that *Ibas*, ever after that Explanation, even to his dying day, remained a Catholike.

37. I say yet more for the further clearing of this matter, that neither



neither all, nor so much as any one of all those Easterne Bishops, who tooke part with *Iohn*, consented to *Cyrill* upon his declaration of the twelve Chapters, for *Cyrill* set forth his explanation during the time of the Ephesine Councell, while hee was imprisoned at *Ephesus*, *Cyrill*, saith *Baronius*, being left at *Ephesus*, was not idle there, but knowing that his twelve Chapters were carped at by adversaries, lett by their misinterpretations they might be infringed: *ipse illis explanationem adiecit, himselfe set out an explanation of them.* The very title prefixed to that explanation declares the same: which is, *Cyrills explanation of the twelve Chapters, Edita Ephesi, sacra Synodo exigente published at Ephesus, the holy Synod requiring Cyrill to doe the same.* The Nestorians and their Conventicle witnesse this most clearly: for they who stayed at *Ephesus*, writ thus to the Legates, whom they sent to the Emperour at *Constantinople*. *We have sent unto you, recens factam expositionem ab Alexandrino, hereticorum capitulorum, the Explanation of the hereticall Chapters lately made by Cyrill of Alexandria.* This was writ by the Ephesine Conventicle, before the dissolution of the Synod, which ended about the eighth day of November:

o Bar. an. 431. m.  
153.

p. diff. Cont. Ephes.  
10. 5. ca. 1.

q. Eorum Epist. extat  
in Append. ad 10. 3.  
Act. Com. Ephes. ca.  
7. append.

r. Fin. in Not. ad  
Counc. Ephes. pa. 912.  
a.

To. 3. Act. Eph. in  
append. ca. 7.

r. Epist. legatarum ad  
suos in Epheso. in ap-  
pend. 10. 3. Act. ca.  
10. pa. 791. b.

u. Dicitur hoc con-  
troversa deos aut  
tres annos post Conc.  
Ephesinum dissolu-  
tum. Pax quarto  
demum anno impe-  
trata est. Rim. Not.  
ante cap. 1. 10. 5.  
AA. Eph.

38. Now that upon this explanation published by *Cyrill*, the Easterne Bishops did not consent to *Cyrill*, nor runne to communicate with him, their owne words in the Epistle of the Conventicle last cited, doe make manifest, where they say of this explanation of *Cyrill*, that he doth *evidentius per illam ostendere suam impietatem*, more plainly by it shew his impiety, then by the Chapters themselves. So they more detested that explanation then the Chapters explained, it was more hereticall in their judgement then the other. And *Iohn* himselfe with the other Legates, assented to the judgement of their fellowes: *wee are ready to say they so strive unto death, and neither receive Cyrill, neque capitula ab eo exposita, neither the Chapters by him explained.* Whence it is without all doubt, that neither all, nor any at all, not *Iohn* himselfe, who was the ringleader to the rest, did consent to *Cyrill* and hold communion with him, upon his publishing that Explanation of his Chapters, or upon their knowing thereof.

39. But how long after this explanation, was it before their union and communion with *Cyrill*? *Pelagius* and *Binius* say that those jartes continued for three yeares after the end of the Councell. So directly doe they controule the Popes *Constitution*, wherein *Vigilius* so often affirmeth, that upon the publishing of *Cyrills* explanation they ranne to communicate with *Cyrill*. But because the account of *Pelagius* and *Binius* is certainly false, we will not presse the Pope therewith. Thus much is evident, that the union betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrill* was not concluded till December, in the next yeare after the Councell was ended. For *Cyrill* received neither *Iohn*, nor any of the rest (save onely *Paulus Emisenus*) till *Paulus* came the second time to *Alexandria*,

P

bringing

\* Vid. sup. ca. 11.

x Chriath mensis Ægyptiaci quartus à Theob. in quo est Æquinoctium æstivum vid. Ioseph. Scalig. lib. 4. de Emend. temp. in Anno Ægypt. & lib. 7. in mensium divis. pa. 378.  
y Epist. Cyrill. 28.

bringing with him the orthodoxall profession of *Iohn* \*, and the other Bishops with him, at which time the union was fully concluded, and in token thereof both *Paulus* made that his memorable Sermon at *Alexandria*, on the twenty and ninth day of the month \* *Chriath*, which answereth to our December; and *Cyrill* writ that y Epistle, as an hymne of joy, which beginneth *Let us be glad*, so farre were the Easterne Bishops from hastning or running as *Vigilius* saith to the communion with *Cyrill* upon his explanation made knowne unto them, that they all save *Paul*, stayed a full yeare and more after that explanation, before they made peace or consented with *Cyrill*.

40. The third part of the Popes *Artificium* is his Logicke, which in very truth is nothing else but trifling sophistification: he supposeth that *Cyrills* explanation of the twelve Chapters, was the cause and occasion of the union betwixt *Cyrill*, and the rest. It was not, for that was published, and knowne unto them, more then an whole yeare before the union: nay that explanation did more alienate their minds from *Cyrill*, they detested that, more then the Chapters themselves, as we have clearly proved; so far was it from effecting the union, that it increased the breach and dis-union. The onely true, and certaine cause of the union, was the relenting of the Easterne Bishops, from their former stoumacke, obstinacie, and heresie; their subscribing to all that *Cyrill* required of them, to wit, to the condemning of *Nestorius*, and his heresies: till they did this, *Cyrill* was unmoveable, inflexible to any union: as soone as ever this was done, *Cyrill* most gladly embraced them, and sung his hymne, *Let the heavens rejoyce*, for their consenting to the Catholike faith. *Vigilius* still harps on a wrong string, and fallaciouly puts *non causam, pro causa*, which was not fitting for the Popes gravitie & judgment.

41. The fourth and fift which are the chiefe parts of my Authors *Artificium*, concerne his Ethicall, and Theologicall knowledge, which being confused and mingled together throughout this whole text, and manifesting the Pope to joyne to his heresie, slander, I must bee forced to handle them both together. These consist in that which the Pope so often beats upon, that *Cyrill* explaned his Chapters, and upon that explanation, *Ibas* and the other Easterne Bishops ranne to embrace him, and his communion, what thinke you is that explanation of *Cyrills* Chapters, which the Pope so eagerly urgeth, and makes the cause of the union with *Ibas* and the rest? Truly thats a mysterie indeed, and containes in it the pith of Nestorianisme: *Baronius* was very loath to unfold this secret of the Popes Art: but I hope to make it so perspicuous, as that none shall bemoane the want of the Cardinalls Commentarie in this point.

42. The Nestorians being as *Cyrill* \* saith, *tantum ad calumniandum nati, men composed of lyes and slanders*, boasted that at the time of the union, the Catholikes had renounced and condemned their

x *Cyrill. Epist. 28.*  
que extat etiam in:  
*Act. Conc. Ephest. 10.*  
5. ca. 6.

their former doctrines, and in all points consented unto them. And in particular they avouched this of *Cyrill* who was the chief agent on the Catholikes part, and who most zealously had opposed himselfe to their heresie. This hath beene so clearly proved before<sup>a</sup>; both by the Epistles of *Cyrill*, by the writings of *Theodoret*, and by this very Epistle of *Ibas*, that I thinke it superfluous to adde ought thereunto. Now the same Nestorians being no lesse subtle, then malicious: when they spake or writ of this matter to any of their owne comforts, to their *Electi*, one of which this *Maris* was to whom *Ibas* writ, then they said in plaine termes, that *Cyrill* (and the other Catholikes) had recalled, condemned; or anathematized his twelve Chapters, and his former doctrine; as in the end of this Epistle *Ibas* tells *Maris*, and wilheth him to shew the same, *Omni bus patribus nostris pacem amantibus*, to all their Fathers, to the whole society of Nestorians, and all that loved the peace with them, that *Cyrill* did now, *contraria docere priori doctrina*, teach the contrarie to his former doctrine, that hee anathematized it and all that held it. Loe heres plaine dealing with *Maris*. *Cyrill* now condemneth and anathematizeth his twelve Chapters: but when they spake to men otherwise affected then themselves, to such as could not endure to heare that *Cyrill* had recanted or anathematized his former doctrine, and Chapters, then they would not use such harsh and homely words of *Cyrill*, but they would signifie the same thing, by a more facile, faire, and courteous phrase, saying *Cyrill* explained his Chapters, and they upon his explanation, received him into their communion, and held him for a Catholike.

43. This to be that which *Ibas* and other Nestorians meant by *Cyrill*s explanation of his Chapters, the words of *Ibas* himselfe uttered in the judgement, before *Photius*, & *Eustathius*, 16 yeares after the union, doe make cleare; for although *Ibas* had then in the maine point renounced Nestorianisme: yet he still retained a touch or smack of their Nestorian language, hee had not as yet perfectly learned to pronounce *Shibboleth*, nor wholly weaned himselfe, or disused his tongue from those Nestorian phrases, which were so familiar in their mouthes. In those acts, *Maris*<sup>a</sup> accuseth *Ibas* to have said of himselfe and the other Easterne Bishops, *we would not have received Cyrill; unlesse he had anathematized his*<sup>b</sup> *Chapters*. *Ibas* answered; I said, that neither I nor they would have received him, *nisi seipsum interpretatus fuisset, unlesse he had explained himselfe*. And when *Maris* againe replied, what? Did you not say, *quando flagitatum est in secreto, when you were privately*, and in secret demanded, did you not then say, I received not *Cyrill*, *donec anathematizasset sua capitula*, till he had anathematized his owne Chapters? *Ibas* to this answered: Truly, I remember not whether I said so or no: *Si autem dixi, verè dixi, quia orientale Concilium recepit eum sua capitula retrahentem*, but if I said it, I said but the truth, for the Easterne Councill re-

<sup>a</sup> Extant in Conc. Chalced. Act. 10. pa. 112. b.  
<sup>b</sup> Non dixisset quia nisi anathematizasset capitula sua, non reciperemus eum. ibid.



ceived Cyrill when hee had recalled his Chapters, otherwise I would have accounted him an hereticke. So answered Ibas: plainly calling that in the one place the anathematizing, and retracting of his Chapters, which in the other he called explaining or interpreting his Chapters; but the one was spoken in secret, the other openly, and by the one which is plaine, he sheweth what they meant by that milde phrase of explaining Chapters; and the like words are there often repeated.

c Bar. an. 448. nu.  
65.

44. *Baronius* darkely saw, and closely signified this, when reciting the effect of *Ibas* answer at that judgement, he saith: that *Ibas* professed, that he called *Cyrill* an hereticke, before the union was concluded; *postquam vero declarando sua Capitula, Cyrillus ista purgavit, & ob eam causam inita est inter eos concordia, but after that Cyrill by explaining his Chapters had purged them, and the union for that cause (of purging them) was once made, never after that did Ibas call Cyrill an hereticke.* So *Baronius*: declaring evidently, that whē *Ibas* said that *Cyrill* expounded, or explained his Chapters, that explanation which hee meant, was in truth a purging of those Chapters. And what was there, or is, in any one of those twelve Chapters to be purged out? They are all & wholly <sup>d</sup> orthodoxall, approved in ever part, both by the holy Ephesine Councell, and after that by the Councell at *Chalcedon*.<sup>e</sup> Seeing in them, and every part of them there is not one dramme of any drosse, seeing all of them are the pure and refined Catholike faith, if ought at all bee purged out of them, it must needs be a Catholike doctrine, a position of the Catholike faith: the purging and wiping away of any part, purgeth out the whole Catholike faith, every part of it being so connexed with golden linkes together, that no man can deny one unlesse hee renounce all; nor purge out any of that vitall blood, but in stead thereof will succeed all the blasphemous humors of the Nestorians; Since the explanation which *Ibas* meant was joynd with a purging of those Chapters, it was not, nor could it be any other but a plaine deniall, condemning and anathematizing of those Chapters, and of the whole Catholike faith.

d Quod nulla ex  
parte ab Evangelica  
& Apostolica do-  
ctrina aberraverim,  
id, postquam Episto-  
las quas ad Nestori-  
um conscripseram  
(earum una habet  
illa 12. Capitula  
(ea extat. to. 1. Act  
Con. Ephes. ca. 14.)  
legissent, communi  
omnium sententia  
confessi sunt omnes.  
Cyril. Ep. ad Imper.  
to. 5. Act. Epb. ca. 2.  
pa. 829. a.  
e Conc. Chal. in de-  
fin. fidei. Act. 5.

45. This will bee more cleare, if we consider the occasion of this phrase, and why the Nestorians called that an Explanation, which (as they meant) was a condemnation of his Chapters. *S. Cyrill*, as he was most orthodoxall in this point for his sense, so for his words he was not so strict and precise, but sometimes tooke the word *Nature* in an ample, and catachresticall signification, for *Person*, but commonly in the proper and usuall signification, for *Essence*, whensoever he tooke it in the later sense, hee never then said that there was one onely nature in Christ, which was the heresie of *Apollinarium*, and *Eutiches*, but hee still professed and maintained two natures, that is, two essences, against *Apollinarium*, to be truly in Christ. But when he said that one Nature was in Christ, he then ever meant one Person, & not one

one Essence. And in this use of the word [Nature] hee followed *Athanasius*, whose words he alledgeth and approveth, we <sup>e</sup> confesse Christ to be the Sonne of God, according to the spirit; and to be the Sonne of Man, according to the flesh, <sup>i</sup> *non quoniam duo sunt viri, non duo nature, sed quia una natura*; but one nature of the Word incarnate: Did *Athanasius* deny two essences; either the divinitie or humanitie in Christ? Nothing lesse: in that very sentence he professeth him to be truly God, and truly Man: but taking the word Nature for Person, hee in that sense truly denies two, and professeth but one Nature; that is, one naturall subsistence or Person to be in him. In like sort *Cyrril* himselfe, in his Epistle 8 to *Succensus*, affirmeth that there is, *una natura Dei verbi incarnati, one Nature of the Sonne of God incarnate*: that is, the Sonne of God, being now incarnate is one Nature, or naturall subsistence, or one, and not two persons, and yet one consisting of two natures, that is, two essences, the divine nature assuming flesh, and the humane nature being personally united unto the Godhead: which to bee his true meaning, besides *Iustinians* <sup>h</sup> testimonie, infinite places doe make evident, those especially in his booke de <sup>i</sup> *fide recta ad Theodosium*, where he saith <sup>k</sup> the scripture sometimes ascribes all that is spoken of Christ, to the man, sometimes all, unto God, and speaketh right in both, *propter utriusque natura in unam, eandemque personam coitionem*, by reason that both the natures do meete in one, and the selfe same person. Nor may we thinke this diverse use of the same word, to be strange or unlawful, but as the name of Father, is given even in Scripture unto the Son <sup>l</sup>, when it is taken essentially, or put in opposition to the creatures; but never when it is taken personally, or put in opposition to the Sonne; Even so, when the name of Nature is taken, (as in *Athanasius*, *Cyrril*, and others sometimes it is) without an opposition to Person, it may there signifie the same with Person, and note any naturall subsistence: but when in any speech there is expressed, or implied an opposition of Nature unto Person, there it ought onely to signifie the substances, or essences concurrent in in that person, and not the Person it selfe. Nor was it so great a fault in the Nestorians to take the word Nature for Person, but partly in drawing that which was the improper, and abusive, into the ordinarie and usuall signification, (they seldome by Nature noting ought but Person) and specially for that they tooke Nature for Person, even in those very speeches wherein was noted and expressed an opposition of Nature unto Person, as in that profession which they made, acknowledging in Christ two natures and one person: where taking Nature for Person, they were enforced to take one Person, for one by affection, or cohabitation: neither of which truly making one person, they called that, one person, which in truth was not one, but divers distinct persons.

46. This profession of one Nature, that is, of one naturall sub-

<sup>f</sup> *Athanasii verba apud Cyrrilum lib. de rect. fide ad Imper. to. 1. Act. Eph. Conc. ca. 5. 6. Patro. pa. 673. a.*

<sup>g</sup> *Ex Epistola Cyrril. citatur a Iustiniano in Edict. S. Creditum.*

<sup>h</sup> *Ise pater (Cyrril.) quoties unam naturam dixit verbi incarnatam, Natura nomine pro substantia usus est, Iustin. in Edict. S. Creditum, pa. 493. a.*  
<sup>i</sup> *Exist. to. 1. Act. Conc. Eph. ca. 5.*  
<sup>k</sup> *Ibid. S. Quia. pa. 666. a.*

<sup>l</sup> *Tota Trinitas est Pater noster per creationem et gubernationem, ut Euseb. 63. Et nunc Domine; Pater noster est: licet persona Patris dicatur Patris Christi per naturam. Aquin. in ca. 1. Epist. 2. ad Cor. v. 1. Et Paternitas in divinis prius importat respectum personae ad personam, quam respectum Dei ad creaturam. Aquin. p. 1. q. 33. art. 3.*

m Ibas in Epist.  
apud Conc. Chal.  
Act. 10.

n Locis citatis paulo ante.

o Si quis Dei verbum  
carne secundum Hypo-  
stasim unitum non  
confitetur, anathema  
sit, Ana h. Cyr.  
2 Si quis Hypostasem  
(.i. Personam) in  
Christo distinguit et  
non connectit eas  
committit, one illaque  
est xpi & yvov pver-  
nulu, anathema sit.  
Idem anath. 3. to. 1.  
Act. Conc. Ephes.  
ca. 14.

p Theod. repreh. Ca-  
pit. Cyrill. Anath.  
3. extant ejus verba  
in Append tom. 9.  
Act. Conc. Ephes. ca.  
2. pa. 861 b.

q Voces quas de se  
servatas nititur du-  
abus subsistentiis aut  
personis, nequaquam  
tribuimus. Nam et si  
ex duabus rebus  
esset diversis in uni-  
tatem inseparabilem  
coacturum, &c. Cyrill.  
Epist. ad Nestorium  
ante Conc. Ephes.  
extat tom. 1. Act.  
Conc. Ephes. ca. 14.  
§ Porro.

r Duarum natura-  
rum facta est unio,  
Cyrill. Epist. ad Jo-  
han. Antioch. cu flet  
unio. to. 9. Act. Conc.  
Eph. ca. 6. § confite-  
mur.

s Unam verbi Dei  
subsistentiam esse  
verissimum est, quam  
incarnata novimus,  
— secundum hoc  
unum & soli Natu-  
rarum vel substantiarum discrimen observatur. Cyril. Epist. ad Acac. post unionem. to. 5. ca. 7. u Si esset duo esset in  
Christo naturae, & substantiae, quas nonnumquam etiam substantias vocat, ut in defens. amth. 1. contra Theod.  
Rerum inquit ipsarum sive substantiarum conventum est factum. to. 5. ca. 1. pa. 860. b. & licet nos intelligamus unitas esse  
subsistentiam, def. anath. 3. ib. pa. 863. a. Ubi clarum est Cyrillum uti voce substantiarum non pro personis, sed pro substan-  
tiis & Naturis, et sic loquitur iuxta usum haereticorum, nam ut habetur apud Theod. lib. 1. Epist. ad Jo. Antioch. cap. 2. ubi  
um ita dicebat. Nos hanc habemus catholicam fidem, quia & yvov vntgam, in dno & apud nos vntgam vntgam  
profiteretur in deo patre et filio unam hypostasim vel substantiam, sed etiam se utraque in sensu haereticis vulgato &  
vulgariter intellecto, scilicet quod una sit essentia et substantia eorum non quod una sit persona.

sistence, or of one person, the Nestorians disliked in *Cyrill*, and in his Chapters, and thought it (but very falsely) to be the same which *Apollinaris* taught, as appeareth by the *Epistle* of *Ibas*, where he thus writeth, *Cyrill* confuting the Bookes of *Nestorius* hath written, as *Apollinaris* did, *that God himselfe, or the Word, is made man*, so that there is no difference betwixt the Temple, and him who dwelleth in the Temple, for he hath written twelve Chapters, to shew, *quia una est natura divinitatis, & humanitatis, that there is one nature of the Deitie, and humanitie in Christ*, which thing is full of impiety. So *Ibas*, reproving *Cyrill* and condemning in his Chapters the teaching of one Nature (to wit of one person) so that according to him the temple and inhabiter in it, are one and the same person. And *Cyrill* so taught indeed, that they were one nature in that sense, howbeit in his Chapters hee doth not call them one nature, but the Nestorians confounding Nature with person, upon *Cyrills* words, where in his Chapters he plainly teacheth them, to be one person \*, or one natural subsistence, affirmed him to say in them, that they were one Nature as they tooke Nature, which is true, for in his Chapters, he teacheth them indeed to be one person, which in the Nestorian language is one Nature. The very same by *Theodoret's* words is most cleare, who \* for this cause reproved *Cyrills* Chapters, because he taught in them, *non oportere subsistentias sive naturas dividere*, that the subsistences, that is, the Natures ought not to be divided, and then he against *Cyrill*, having opposed that there is in Christ, both the perfect subsistence of God, and the perfect forme or subsistence of man, he addeth, that it is pious to confesse them both to be one Person, one Sonne, one Christ, and withall not amisse to call them *duas subsistentias, sive Naturas, two distinct subsistencies or Natures united*, and often doth he teach the like, manifestly shewing, that both himselfe, as the other Nestorians, rooke Natures for Person, or personall subsistence, and that they condemned *Cyrills* Chapters for this cause, for that he denied two Natures (in that sense) to be in Christ, that is, two persons to be in him.

47. Now it is cleare and certaine, that *Cyrill* as well before, as at, and after the union professed two natures, that is, two distinct essences, or substances to be in Christ, but so, that they both concurred to make but one person, which is both God and Man. And it is not unlike, but that *Cyrill*, as in his writings, so in his speeches (even to *Paulus B. of Emisa*) professed thus much, when he came to deale about the union, and in that defence of



his Chapters, which he made in his refutation of *Theodoret*, this is often signified. Hence now the Nestorians tooke occasion of their speech. They knowing that *Cyrill* professed two Natures, tooke him to meane as themselves did, *two Persons* thereby; maliciously suppressing what *Cyrill* added, for the declaration of his meaning, that those two natures did both make but one Person, or personall subsistence. This being concealed, and the words (Natures) being taken not for essences, or substances; (as *Cyrill* meant) but, as the Nestorians misconstrued him, for Persons, they with great ostentation gave out amongst their friends, and slandered *Cyrill*, to have now so expounded, and explained his Chapters, as that he thereby wholly consented unto them, and recalled and condemned all his former Chapters, and doctrine. That this was the meaning of the Nestorians, in saying *Cyrill* explained his Chapters, the words of *Ibas* spoken before *Photius* and *Eustathius* compared with his *Epistle*, makes undoubted. For what there hee calls, three or foure times before them, interpreting, saying *I, I myselfe and the Eastern Bishops did not nor would receive Cyrill: nor make union, nor hold communion with him, donec interpretatus est, till he had explained his meaning*, and interpreted those Chapters, that, in other places of those acts, as also in his *Epistle*, he in plaine tearmes calleth *anathematizing* his Chapters, the doctrine of one Person taught therein, saying, *Paulus required Cyrill, to anathematize such as professe one Nature* (that is by the Nestorian dialect) *one person in Christ*, and God inclined the heart of the Egyptian to consent hereunto, and so contention ceased, and peace was made, and *Cyrill*, and the rest doe now teach *Contraria priori doctrina*, the quite contrarie to their former doctrine, for before *Cyrill* taught in his Chapters, as *Ibas* said, *that there is one Nature* (that is one person) & that there is no (personall) difference betwixt the temple, and him that dwelleth in the temple; but now no man (not *Cyrill* himselfe nor any other) dare say that there is one Nature, (that is one Person) of the deitie and humanitie, but all doe now professe to beleeve in the temple (as one person) and in him who dwelleth in the temple (as another distinct person.) So *Ibas*, expressly calling that in one place *Cyrill's* anathematizing of his Chapters, which in the other he calleth the explanation of his chapters. And this the *Epistle* of *Cyrill* to *Acacius* doth further witnesse, for he hearing how the Nestorians slandered him in this point, doth there at large declare, how by his profession of two natures, he did not consent with them, in teaching two persons, but did ever both before and after the union, teach the same truth herein, to wit, that in Christ there are two natures, (that is essences or substances) against the Appollinarians, and yet that Christ is but one Person, or personall subsistence, against the Nestorians. So untruly did they slander him to teach contrarie to his Chapters, or by his explaining of them, to have condemned

x In *Act.* apud *Photium* qui habentur in *conc. chal. Act.*  
y *Ibid.* pa. 113. a.  
z *Ibid.* pa. 112. b.  
a *Iba Epist. in fine*

b *Ibas* in principio *Epistole*.

c *Cyr epist. ad Acac.* qua est 29. et exiat, to. 5. *Act. Conc. Eph.* ca. 7.  
d *Scripti, me neque cum Ario, neque cum Apollinario* (scilicet) *unquam* sed opus esse Naturarum observare differentias, ib. 5. *Audivi, Nestory cacodoxia ab hac doctrinalongè diversa est, nam duas Naturas nominat, easque a se invicem divellit. Dehinc* (scilicet) *componit* (ut una personam) *scilicet* *non itidem* (scilicet) *componit* (ut aliam personam) *ibid.* 5. *Verum dicent.*

demned, recalled, and anathematized his Chapters.

48. We doe now clearly see, not onely that the explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, which *Ibas*, and the other Nestorians of his time meant, is an utter condemning of them all; but upon what pretence and occasion they called his anathematizing, an Explanation of his Chapters. If now it may further appeare, that *Vigilius* in his Constitution meant this Nestorian, and slanderous Explanation; I doubt not, but his text will bee sufficient, easie, and cleare in this point: And though none, who diligently peruse the Popes words, can, as I thinke, doubt hereof; yet because it is not fit, in a just Commentary, to give naked asseverations, specially in a point of such moment, I will propose three or foure reasons to make evident the same. The first is taken from the correspondence and parity of the effect, which followed upon this Explanation, as the cause therof: It is no doubt but *Vigilius* meant such an explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, as upon w<sup>ch</sup>, that union which *Ibas* held with *Cyrill*, at the time when he writ this *Epistle*, ensued; for *Vigilius* proveth *Ibas* at that time to have bin a Catholike, because upon *Cyrils* Explanation, he forthwith embraced the union with *Cyrill*, and ran to communicate with him. Now it is certaine, that *Ibas*, when he writ this *Epistle*, approved not the orthodoxall, and true union, which *Cyrill* truly made with *Iohn*, and the rest, upon their profession of the orthodoxall faith, sent unto him; but onely the union in Nestorianisme, the slanderous union, which they falsely affirmed *Cyrill* to have made; wherefore it certainly followeth, that the Explanation of *Cyrill*, which *Vigilius* intendeth, as a cause of that union, can bee no other then the slanderous explanation; wherein *Cyrill* was falsely said to have explained his Chapters; that is, anathematized them, and the doctrine delivered in them: for the true and orthodoxall explanation neither did, nor could effect that union in Nestorianisme, w<sup>ch</sup> *Ibas* embraced at the time when he writ this *Epistle*; it was the condemning of his Chapters, and in such sort to explain them, that they were anathematized; it was this, and no other explanation, which did make the union, whereof *Ibas* boasteth. Seeing then the hereticall union of *Ibas*, followed upon that explanation which *Vigilius* here meaneth, it is doubtlesse, that the explanation also which hee intendeth, is the same slanderous, & hereticall explanation, which *Ibas*, and the other Nestorians ascribed to *Cyril*, & upon which they joyned in union and communion with him. The cause was like the effect; the effect, an hereticall, and slanderous union; the cause, an hereticall and slanderous explanation.

49. The other reason is taken from the words of *Vigilius*, which, being very pregnant to this purpose, I shall desire the reader diligently to consider the same. *Vigilius* having said, that, upon *Cyrils* Explanation, *Ibas*, with all the Easterne Bishops, held *Cyrill* for a Catholike; addeth this collection thereupon;

f His ab to explana-  
tis, in communionem  
ejus devotè concur-  
rit. Vig. Const. nu.  
193.  
g Et ante probatum  
est ca. 11.

b Vig. Const. nu. 193.

*Ex quo apparet*, By this it appeareth, *Ibas*, both before hee understood the twelve Chapters of *Cyrills*, and when he suspected one Nature to be taught thereby, *orthodoxo sensu, quod male dictum existimabat, reprobasse; then to have reprov'd those Chapters in an orthodoxall sense;* and also after the Explanation of them, *orthodoxo sensu, quare recte dicta cognoverat, venerabiliter suscepisse; then to have approved them very reverently,* and in an orthodoxall sense embraced that which he knew to bee rightly spoken therein. So *Vigilius*: plainly affirming the sense of *Ibas* to have been orthodoxall, both before, and after the Explanation, or *union* (made by *Iohn*, and all the rest,) with *Cyrill*: At both those times the doctrine, sense, and meaning of *Ibas* was the same, and at both orthodoxall: and *Cyrill*, by that Explanation which *Vigilius* meaneth, declared his Chapters to have the very same meaning, and orthodoxall sense which *Ibas* had; which, when *Ibas* perceived to bee the sense of *Cyrill*, forthwith he held *Cyrill* for a Catholike, and joyned communion with him, and reverently received his doctrine, as being consonant to the sense of *Ibas*, which was still orthodoxall; so there was no alteration in the sense of *Ibas*, that both before, and after *Cyrills* Explanation, was orthodoxall, onely before the union, or Explanation *Ibas* mis understood *Cyrills* meaning, and thought he had taught one Nature to bee in Christ, whereas *Cyrill* by his Explanation shewed, that he meant just as *Ibas* did, that there were in Christ two Natures, even in that orthodoxall sense which *Ibas* had held, as well before, as after the Explanation.

*i Cum omnibus Orientalibus Episcopis. Ibid.*

50. Oh what a Circean Cup is Heresie? specially Nestorianisme? Pope *Vigilius* doth now shew himselfe in his colours, and demonstrates that he is, as by some *jurisconsults*, quite transformed into *Nestorius*, *Theodorus*, or if there be any more hereticall than they in that kinde; for what, thinke you, was that sense of *Ibas*, which the Pope commends for orthodoxall? what was it first after the Explanation and *union* made betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrill*? I have manifested this before, and the *Epistle* of *Ibas*, written two yeares at least after that *union*, doth make it undeniably evident, that his sense was then, *that there are two natures, making two persons in Christ*, that the temple, and the inhabiter in the temple are two distinct persons, that *Cyrills* Chapters were hereticall, in teaching one Nature, that is, one Person in Christ; in a word, his sense then was, that Nestorianisme, and nothing but Nestorianisme was Catholike, & that the decree at *Ephesus*, against *Nestorius* was hereticall doctrine. This sense of *Ibas*, *Vigilius*, by his Pontificall and Cathedral *Constitution*, adjudgeth, and decreeth to be orthodoxall, and Catholike. Could *Nestorius* judge otherwise, or with any other judgement?

*Ut liquet ex Ibas Epist.*

51. It may be the sense of *Ibas* was better before the *union* and Explanation; what was it then? Truly it was the very selfe same: So long, saith *Ibas*, as the Easterne Council anathematized

*I Vespasiano d. Sic apud Theonem in Conc. Chal. Act. 10. p. 112. b.*

*Cyrill;*



in Vid. decretum  
Conciliabuli tom. 3.  
Act. Conc. Ephes.  
ed. 2. et reliquis cap.

*Cyrrill*, (which was still, till the union) *sequutus sum Primatem meum*, I followed my Primate, that was, *Iohn of Antioch*; what his sense was, and the Synods with him, that was my sense. Now the sense of *Iohn*, and his Conventicle, set downe in more than twenty Synodall Epistles<sup>m</sup> of theirs, was, that *Cyrils twelve Chapters* were hereticall, contrary to the Evangelicall and Apostolicall doctrine, that there are two Natures, making two Persons in Christ; that to teach one Nature, that is, one Person in Christ, was hereticall: that *Cyrrill*, and all that took part with him; or consented to his Chapters, were heretikes; yea, condemned and anathematized heretikes; that the holy Ephesine Councell was a Conspiracie of heretikes, of seditious and factious persons. This was the sense of *Iohn*, this the sense of *Ibas* before the union: and this sense the Popes Holiness hath decreed to be a Catholike and orthodoxall sense: The sense of *Ibas*, saith hee, both before the Explanation, or union, and after it, was orthodoxall; so, by the Pope *Vigilius* his decree, it is good Catholike doctrine to teach two Persons in Christ; to teach, *Cyrrill*, *Calestine*, the whole Ephesine Councell, to be heretikes, that is, in a word, to teach Nestorianisme, and nothing but Nestorianisme to be the Catholike faith.

52. But that which I principally aimed at, out of those words of *Vigilius*, was, to observe, that *Cyrils* Explanation here mentioned, and meant by *Vigilius*, neither is, nor can be ought else but an absolute condemning, and anathematizing of his twelve Chapters; for by that explanation, which *Vigilius* intendeth, *Cyrrill* shewed, that his sense was the very same with that which *Ibas* had before, and after the union, but that sense which *Ibas* had before, and divers yeares after the union, was, that the two Natures in Christ make two distinct Persons, and that *Cyrils* twelve Chapters, in which it is constantly taught, that there is but one Person (or, as the Nestorians spake, but one nature) in Christ, are hereticall, and to be anathematized, as being contrary to the Catholike faith; wherefore, that Explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, which *Vigilius* intendeth, is certainly a declaring and acknowledgment, that there is not one, but two distinct Persons in Christ; and that his own twelve Chapters, for teaching but one Person, are all of them hereticall, and to be anathematized.

53. The third reason is taken from *Vigilius* his scope and purpose in this whole passage: Suppose *Vigilius* to have meant the orthodoxall Explanation<sup>a</sup> set out by *Cyrrill*, seeing that is wholly repugnant to the Epistle of *Ibas*, which is full fraught with Nestorianisme: *Vigilius* by approving that Explanation, had condemned this Epistle of *Ibas*, and every part thereof. Seeing then by that Explanation which *Vigilius* intendeth, his purpose is, to confirm, and strengthen this Epistle of *Ibas*, and prove it to bee orthodoxall, which is onely done by approving the slanderous Explanation of *Cyrrill* to be orthodoxall; the very scope, and maine purpose of *Vigilius* doth declare, that it is not, nor can be the orthodoxall,

n Quæ extat in  
Actis Conc. Ephes.  
to. 5. ca. 1.  
o Non diceret Iu-  
venalis Ibas esse  
orthodoxum,  
nisi ex ver-  
bis Epistolæ, ejus  
confessionem fidei  
orthodoxam com-  
proberet. Vig.  
Cap. 12. 193.

rhodoxall, but the slanderous and hereticall Explanation only of *Cyrils* Chapters, which the Pope here meant, and by which, being commended for Catholike, hee indevoureth to prove the Epistle, which shewes *Ibas* to have consented most gladly, and reverently, as the Pope saith, to it, to bee indeed Catholike.

54. The fourth and last reason is taken from the fit coherence, and congruity, which this exposition of *Vigilius* meaning, hath, with his whole text concerning this matter. Take him to speake of the true and orthodoxall explanation of *Cyrill*, his words are riddles, more obscure than *Plato's* numbers, yea, they are unreconciliable to the truth of the story: *Ibas*, saith the Pope, upon *Cyrils* Explanation, hastened and ran to communicate with *Cyrill*: Expound this of *Cyrils* orthodoxall Explanation, it is utterly untrue; *Ibas* detested that, more than the Chapters themselves; hee neither ranne to embrace that, nor *Cyrill* for that, hee fled from it as a serpent: and the like may be said of the rest. But take *Vigilius* to speake (as indeed he doth) of this slanderous and hereticall Explanation, and then all the words of *Vigilius* are not onely coherent among themselves, but perspicuous and easie. *Ibas* by an error: mis-understood the words of *Cyrill*, (as thinking him to teach one Nature, that is, one Person in Christ) and then hee spake injuriously against him, and called him an heretike; sed intellectu Capitulum meliorem recepit; but when *Ibas* better understood the Chapters of *Cyrill*, (when hee knew that *Cyrill* professed two Natures, that is, two persons in Christ; and that *Cyrill* expounded his Chapters in such sort, that the humanitie and deitie, were each a distinct person) then *Ibas* amended all that he had said amisse of *Cyrill*, and called him no more an heretike, but embraced him as a Catholike. Again, *Ibas* blamed *Cyrill*, while he understood not his Chapters aright, (while he thought, that but one person had beene taught therein) but afterwards, his ab eo explanatis & intellectis; when *Cyrill* had explained himselfe, and *Ibas* understood his meaning, (that hee meant either nature to a severall person, and so that there were two natures in *Ibas* sense; that is, two persons in Christ) then, devotè concurrit, *Ibas* ran so communicate, and shake hands with *Cyrill*. Againe, how should we not receive *Ibas*, being a Catholike, who though hee seemed to speak against *Cyrill*, while he mis-understood his Chapters; nunc ab eo in quo fallebatur intellectu conversus; Now upon *Cyrils* Explanation, hee is converted from that error, whereby hee was deceived: (for now he seeth *Cyrill* to professe two Natures, in the Nestorian sense, that is, two persons, whereas he erroneously thought *Cyrill* to teach but one Person in Christ:) Againe, nothing is reproved of the confession of *Ibas*, (that is orthodoxall, as teaching two natures, that is, two persons in Christ) but *Ibas* hath refuted all, quod fallente intelligentia de Cyrillo male senserat; which hee thought amisse of *Cyrill*, by the error of his misconceiving *Cyrils* meaning,

P In Const. nu. 193  
q Misimus vestra  
Inclitanti recens fa-  
ctam expositionem  
ab Alexandrino, ha-  
retico, et Capitu-  
lorum, evidentius e-  
tiam per illam ofen-  
dite suam impietate,  
ait Concilium  
Ephe. in quo Ibas  
in Epist. missa Io-  
hanni, et alijs, in  
Appen. ad 10. 3. Act.  
Eph. Conc. ca. 7. pa.  
790. a. Nō ad mor-  
tem inflare parati  
sumus, et neque Cy-  
rillum, neque ca-  
pitula ab eo expo-  
sita suscipere. Iud.  
ca. 10. pa. 791. b.  
Illa qua in Iba E-  
pistola, in injurijs  
beati Cyrilli per er-  
rorum intell gentia  
dicta sunt. Vig.  
Const. nu. 192. et  
quod de Cyrillo,  
Capitula ejus aliter  
intelligenda detra-  
ciat. Nu. 193.  
Ibid. nu. 192. Po-  
tea professus quia  
bis ab eo explanatis,  
et à se intellectis,  
in communionem e-  
jus devotè concu-  
rrit; et de his, qua  
prius aliter intel-  
lexerat, fit conversus.  
Ibid. nu. 193.  
Post explanationē  
beati Cyrilli fac-  
tam, et intellectum  
Cyrilli sibi (Iba) de-  
claratum, Ibas, Cy-  
rillum, ut orthodox-  
um habuit, et in cō-  
munionem ipsius per-  
mansit. Ib. nu. 194.  
Ibid. nu. 193.  
Ibid.  
Ex quibus evi-  
denter declaratur  
in Iba Episcopo nihil  
de confessione fidei  
reprensivum, quam  
constat esse lauda-  
tam, sed errandam,  
&c. Ibid. nu. 193.

ibid. nu. 195.

x. Invenit est Dioscorus magis contra Ephesine primam Synodum delinquere, qui eam sub execrabili intellectu imagine defendebat, et amplius B. Cyrillum criminatum est, laudans eam Dioscorus, quam Ibas sub falsi intellectus errore vituperans. Vig. Const. Ibid. y. Heretico spiritu Ephesine Synodum, et Cyrillum laudasse reperti sunt Dioscorus, et Eutiches. Ibid. z. At vero Ibas, qui per errorem suum putans in his pradicari naturam (id est personam) prius vituperavit Capitula, et post declaratum sibi intellatum eorum (quod duas naturas Ibe sensu doceret) communicatorem se B. Cyrilli cum omnibus Orientalibus professus est. Ibid. nu. 195. a. Ibid.

ning, (as thinking *Cyrril* to have taught but one Nature, that is, one Person in Christ.) Lastly, the comparison which *Vigilius* sets downe, betwixt *Ibas*, and *Dioscorus*, is hereby made easie and cleare. *Dioscorus*, though hee commended *Cyrril*, and the Ephesine Councell, for teaching one Nature in Christ, (to wit, one Nature in *Dioscorus* sense, that is, one Essence) did more wrong *Cyrril*, and the Councell, than *Ibas*, who condemned them both, teaching one Nature (to wit, one in *Ibas* his sense, that is, one person) in Christ: For *Dioscorus* commended them in an execrable and hereticall sense, (as teaching one nature (in *Dioscorus* sense, that is, one essence, which to affirme is hereticall) but *Ibas* condemned them in an orthodoxall sense, (as thinking them to teach one nature, in *Ibas* his sense, that is, one person in Christ) which to condemne is orthodoxall.) Againe, *Dioscorus*, though it was explained unto him, that neither *Cyrril*, nor the Ephesine Councell taught one nature, in his sense; yet did hee by his hereticall spirit persist in commending them, as agreeing with him in that hereticall doctrine; but *Ibas*, when it was explained unto him, that *Cyrril* and the Ephesine Councell taught not one, but two natures, (in *Ibas* his sense) by his orthodoxall spirit desired presently to condemne them, and then embraced them both, as agreeing with him in his orthodoxall doctrine, of two natures, that is, of two persons in Christ. Lastly, *Dioscorus*, though hee commended them, yet because hee did it in an hereticall sense, and with an hereticall spirit, was justly condemned by the Councell at *Chalcedon*; but *Ibas*, though hee condemned them, yet because he did it in an orthodoxall sense, and with an orthodoxall spirit, amending what by an error, and mis-understanding he had done amisse, was approved by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and judged by them to have continued in the right Catholike faith. Thus by our exposition, that *Vigilius* meant the slanderous, and hereticall explanation of *Cyrril*'s Chapters, is his whole text both coherent, and congruous to it selfe, and very perspicuous, and easie; which, if *Vigilius* should meane, or be expounded to have understood of the true and orthodoxall Explanation of *Cyrril*, would bee, not onely obscure, and inextricable, but even repugnant, as well to the scope as to the words and text of *Vigilius*.

55. Thus the whole text of *Vigilius* being elucidated, it is now easie to discern the two last parts of the Popes *Artificium* which before I mentioned, for now you see that his Divinity is meere heresie, and Nestorianisme, and that his morality is unjustice, falsehood, and calumnie, most injuriously slandering, not onely Saint *Cyrril*, but the holy generall Councells of *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon* to have (like himselfe) defended and embraced the same heresies of *Nestorius*, which by them all, is together with this decree of *Vigilius* anathematized and condemned to the very pit of hell. There needeth not, nor will I seeke any other cen-

sure



a Bar. an. 433.  
nu. 10.

sure of this most shamefull dealing of *Vigilius*; then the very words of *Baronius* concerning the Nestorians. *Hac cum scriberis, persacile intelliges: Seeing you have knowne these things, you may easily perceive*, under whose banner and ensigne these men fight. For seeing you have seene them by calumnies, lyes, and impostures, publishing counterfeite Epistles, (counterfeite explanations) in the names of renowned men (such as *Cyrril* was) and patching lyes unto lyes, you may well know whose souldiers they are, even the ministers of *Sathan*; transfiguring themselves into Angels of Light. *Nescit enim pura religio imposturas, for true Religion is voyd of frauds and impostures*: nor doth the truth seeke lying pretences, nor the catholike faith support it selfe by calumnies and slanders: sincerity goeth secure, attended, onely with simplicity; with which censure of *Baronius* (agreeing indeed to all Nestorians: but in an eminencie, and ~~not~~ to *Vigilius* hee being the Captaine and King of them all) I end my Commentary on the Constitution of *Vigilius*; which although it be not so plausibly set downe as *Baronius* would have done, had hee thought good to have undertaken that office: yet I dare boldly affirme, it is delivered farre more truly, faithfully and agreeably to the text, then either the Cardinal himselfe, or any other of the Popes *Gnathoes* would ever have performed: for as I have not wittingly omitted any one clause, which might breed a doubt in this obscure passage; so have I not wrested the words of *Vigilius* to any other sense; then the coherence of his text; the evidence of reason, and manifold prooffe out of the historical narration and circumstances thereof doe necessarily inferre, and even enforce.

§ 6. My conclusion now of this second reason of *Vigilius* and *Baronius*, for defence of this Epistle of *Ibas*, is this: seeing the one defineth, and the other defendeth both *Ibas* himselfe, and his profession in this Epistle, in this point, and in the sense of *Ibas* to be orthodoxall, because *Ibas* professeth therein two natures, and one person to bee in Christ; and seeing as wee have certainly proved, *Ibas* meant two such natures, as make two distinct persons; and one person, not by a naturall, and hypostaticall union, but onely by affection, liking and cohabitation; which is the very heresie condemned in *Nestorius*: It doth hence clearly and unavoidably ensue, not onely that this third Chapter touching the approving of the Epistle of *Ibas*, doth concerne the faith, and is a question, and cause of faith, but that *Vigilius* first, and next *Baronius*, and then all who by word or writing, doe defend either *Vigilius* or *Baronius*, or the Popes judgment, in causes of faith to be infallible; that they all by defending this Epistle as orthodoxall; or that *Ibas* by it ought to bee judged a Catholike, doe thereby maintaine the condemned heresie of *Nestorius* to be the onely Catholike faith.

## CHAP. XIII.

Two assertions of Baronius, about the defenders of the Three Chapters, refused: and two other against them, confirmed: the one, That to dissent from the Pope in a cause of faith, makes one neither an Heretike, nor a Schismatike: the other, That to assent absolutely in faith to the Pope or present Church of Rome, makes one both an Heretike, and a Schismatike.



Having now demonstratively refuted the first evasion of Baronius, I would proceed to the second, but that Baronius doth enforce me to stay a little, in the examining of two Positions, which he collects and sets downe touching this cause, the former concerning heresie, the later concerning schisme.

a An. 547. nu. 38.

2. His former is this, That both the defenders, and the condemners of these three Chapters were Catholikes, neither of both were Heretikes. *Negatio vel assertio non constituat quemquam hereticum*; neither the condemning of these Chapters, nor the defending of them made one an heretike, unlesse there were some other error joyned with it. Again, in these disputations about the three Chapters, the question was not such, *ut alter ab altero aliter sentiens, dici posset hereticus*: that one dissenting from another herein, might be called an heretike. So Baronius; who to free Vigilius from heresie, acquits all that deale either *pro* or *contra* in this cause, neither one side, nor the other are heretikes.

b An. 553. nu. 23.

3. See how heresie makes a man to dote. That this question about the three Chapters is a cause of faith, wee have cleerly and unanswerably confirmed; and Baronius himselfe hath confessed, That the defenders of them, and condemners, were in a manifest contradiction in this cause; (the former, by an evident consequent and cunningly defending, the other condemning the heresies of Nestorius) is most evident, and yet both of them in the Cardinals judgement are good Catholikes: neither the one, who with the Nestorians deny Christ to be God: nor the other, who affirme him to be God, may be called heretikes. This truly is either the same heresie which the Rhetorians maintained, who as Philastrius saith, praised all sects and opinions, and said they all went the right way, or else it is an heresie peculiar to Baronius, such as none before him ever dreamed of; *It has two contradictories in a cause of faith may be held, and yet neither of them be an heresie, nor the pertinacious defenders of either of them both be heretikes.* Baronius would be famous for a peece of new found learning, and an hereticall quirke, above all that ever went before him, such as by which he hath *ex condigno*, merited an applause of all heretiks which

c Heres. 43. Prætol.  
lib. 17. Heres. 3.

which either have beene or shall arise hereafter. For seeing in this cause of faith two contradictories may be held without heresie, the like may be in every other point of faith; and so with *Vigilius*, the Arians, Eutycheans, and all heretikes shall have their *quietus est*: say what they will in any cause of faith, none may call them heretikes. I commend the Cardinall for his wit. This makes all cocke sure, it is an unexpugnable bulwarke to defend the *Constitution* of Pope *Vigilius*.

4. Say you, neither the defenders, nor the condemners of these Chapters may for that cause bee called heretikes? For the condemners of them, trouble not your wit, they are and shall be ever acknowledged for Catholikes. But for the defenders of them, who are the onely men, that the Cardinall would gratifie by this assertion, I may boldly say with the Prophet <sup>d</sup>, *Though thou wash them with nitre and much sope, yet is their iniquity marked out*: All the water in *Tyber* and *Euphrates* cannot wash away their heresie: for as we have before fully declared, the defending of any one, much more of all these *three Chapters*, is the defending of Nestorianisme, and all the blasphemies thereof, the condemning of the holy Councils of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*, and of all that approve them, that is, of the whole catholike Church, and of the whole Catholike Faith. All these must be hereticall, if the defenders of those *three Chapters* be not heretikes.

d 1er. 2. 23.

5. Now against this assertion of *Baronius*, whereby he would acquit *Vigilius* and all that defend him from heresie: I will oppose another and true assertion, ensuing of that which wee have clearly proved; and this it is: That, *one or moe, either men or Churches may dissent from the Popes Cathedrall and definitive sentence in a cause of faith, made knowne unto them, and yet be no heretikes*. For to omit other instances no lesse effectually, this one concerning *Vigilius*, doth make this most evident. The cause was a cause of faith, as *Baronius* himselfe often professeth. The Popes definitive and Apostolicall sentence in that cause of faith, made for defence of those *three Chapters*, was published and made knowne to the fift generall Councell, and to the whole Church: this also *Baronius* confesseth <sup>e</sup>, and yet they who contradicted the Popes Apostolicall sentence in this cause of faith, made knowne unto them, were not heretikes: this also is the confession of *Baronius*, whose assertion as you have seene is, that neither the condemners of these Chapters, nor the defenders of them were heretiks. So by the Cardinalls owne assertions: one may contradict and oppugne the Popes knowne, Cathedrall, and Apostolicall sentence in cause of faith, and yet bee no heretike. But what speake I of *Baronius*, the evidence and force of reason doth unresistably confirme this. For the whole fift generall Councell contradicted, yea condemned and accursed the Popes Cathedrall and definitive sentence in this cause of faith made knowne unto them. The whole Catholike Church ever since hath approved the fift

e Vid. sup. ca. 5.  
nu. 14.f An. 553. nu. 47.  
vid. sup. ca. 3. nu. 64.



Councell, and the decree thereof, and therefore hath contradicted, condemned and accursed the Popes sentence as the Councell had done. And none I hope will be so impudently hereticall, as to call not onely the fift generall and holy Councell, but the whole Catholike Church of God, heretikes: who yet must all be heretikes, or else the dissenting from, yea the detesting, and accursing the Popes Cathedrall sentence in a *cause of faith*, cannot make one an heretike.

6. I say more, and adde this as a further consequent on that which hath been declared, *That none can now assent to their Popes, or to their Cathedrall definitions and doctrines maintained by the present Romane Church, but eo nomine, even for that very cause, they are convicted, condemned, and accursed heretikes.* For the manifesting of which conclusion, I will begin with that their *fundamentall position of the Popes Cathedrall infallibility* in defining causes of faith, whereof before I have so often made mention. And to prove the present Romane Church to bee hereticall herein, *two things* are to be declared: the one that this is indeed the *position* or doctrine of their Church: the other, that this doctrine is *hereticall*, and for such condemned by the Catholike Church.

7. For the former, that the assertion of Popes *infallibility* in defining causes of faith, is the doctrine of the present Romane Church, I thinke none conversant in their writings will make doubt. Give mee leave to propose some testimonies of their owne. The Pope saith Bellarmine<sup>g</sup>, *when hee teacheth the whole Church those things which belong to faith, nullo casu errare potest, hee can by no possible meanes then erre.* And this, as he saith, is, *certissimum, a most certaine truth*: and in the end hee addeth, this is a signe, *Ecclesiam totam sentire, that the whole Church doth beleve the Pope to be in such causes infallible.* So he testifying this to be the judgement and doctrine of their whole Church. The Iesuite Coster, for himselfe and their whole Church saith, *We<sup>h</sup> doe constantly deny the Popes vel haeresim docere posse vel errorem praponere, to be able either to teach an heresie, or to propose an error to be beleaved.* When the Pope, saith Bozius<sup>i</sup>, *teacheth the Church, or sets forth a decree of faith, Divinitus illi praelusa est omnis via, God then stoppeth every way unto him, which might bring him into error.* Again<sup>k</sup>, in making such decrees, *punquam valuit aut valebit facere contra fidem, he never was, he never shall be able to doe ought against the faith.* We beleve saith Grezer<sup>l</sup>, *the judgement of him who succeeds Peter in the Chaire, non secus ac olim Petri infallibile, to be no otherwise infallible, then the judgement of Peter was.* And the<sup>m</sup> gates of hell shall never be able to drive Peters successours, *ut errorem quempiam ex cathedra definiant, that they shall define any error out of the Chaire.* This is saith Stapleton<sup>n</sup>, a certaine and received truth among Catholikes, *That the Pope when he decreeth ought out of his pontificall office, hath never yet taught any hereticall doctrine,*

g Lib. 4. de pont. ca. 3. §. Sic.

h Ench. sit. de summo pont. §. Fatemur.

i Th. Box lib. 18. de Sig. Eccl. ca. 6. §. Sequitur.

k Idem lib. 16. ca. 8. §. Rursus.

l Def. ca. 3. lib. 4. de Rom. Pont. §. Tertius.

m Idem def. ca. 28. lib. 1. de pontif. §. Quocirca.

n Relect. Cont. 3. qu. 4. §. Chica.

doctrine, nec tradere potest, nor can he deliver any error: yea if it bee a judgement ° of faith, it is not onely false but hereticall, to say that the Pope can erre therein. They, saith Canus <sup>p</sup>, who reject the Popes judgement in a cause of faith, are hereticke. To this accordeth Bellarmine <sup>q</sup>, It is lawfull to hold either part in a doubtfull matter, without note of heresie, before the Popes definition be given: but after the Popes sentence, he who then dissenteth from him is an hereticke. To these may be added, as Bellarmine testifieth <sup>r</sup>, St. Thomas, Thomas Waldensis, Cardinall Turcremata, Cardinall Cajetane, Cardinal Hosius, Driedo, Escius, Iohannes a Lovanio, and Peter Soto, all these teach it to be impossible, that the Pope should define any hereticall doctrine. And after them all, the saying of Gregory de Valentia, is most remarkable to this purpose: It now appeareth, saith he <sup>s</sup>, that Saint Thomas did truly, and orthodoxally teach, that the proposall or explication of our Creed, that is, of those things which are to be beleaved, doth belong unto the Pope: which truth containes so clearely the summe and chiefe point of Catholike religion, ut nemo Catholicus esse possit, qui illam non amplectatur, that none can be a Catholike, unlesse hee hold and embrace this. So he: professing that none are to be held with them for Catholikes, but such as maintaine the Popes infallibilitie in proposing or defining causes of faith.

o Rel. Conc. 6. q. 3.  
Art. 5. S. Respondeo.  
p Loc. Theol. lib. 6.  
ca. 7. S. Quid.  
q Lib. 3. de verb.  
Dei ca. 8. S. Excludimus.

he is on  
hereticke  
+ sayth  
pope may  
err: 91

r Lib. 4. de Pont.  
ca. 2. S. Quarta.

s In 3. 2. disp. 1. q.  
1. punct. 1. part. 30.

8. They have yet another more plausible manner of teaching the Popes Infallibilitie in such causes, and that is by commending the judgement of the Church, and of generall Councils to be infallible. All Catholikes, saith Bellarmine <sup>t</sup>, doe constantly teach that generall Councils, confirmed by the Pope, cannot possibly erre, in delivering doctrines of faith or good life: And this he saith, is so certaine, that *sic catholica tenendum est*, it is to be embraced by the Catholike faith: and so all Catholikes are bound to beleve it. Likewise concerning the Church, he thus writeth <sup>u</sup>, *Nostra sententia est*, it is our sentence, that the Church cannot absolutely erre, in proposing things which are to be beleaved. The same is taught by the rest of their present Church. Now when they have said all, and set it out with great pompe, and ostentation of words, for the infallibility of the Church, and Councils; it is all but a meere collusion, a very maske, under which they cover and convey the Popes Infallibilitie into the hearts of the simple. Try them seriously who list, sound the depth of their meaning, and it will appeare, that when they say, The Church is infallible; Generall Councils are infallible, The Pope is infallible, they never meane to make three distinct infallible Iudges, in matters of faith, but one onely infallible, and that one is the Pope.

t Lib. 2. de Conc. ca.  
2. S. Ac ut.

u Lib. de. Eccles.  
milit. ca. 14. S. No-  
stra.

the church and  
Councils depend  
upon the popes: mis-  
take.

9. This to be their meaning, sometimes they will not let to profess: When we teach, saith Grotius <sup>x</sup>, that the Church is the (infallible) Iudge in causes of faith, per Ecclesiam intelligimus Pontificem Romanum, we by the Church doe meane the Pope for the time being; or him with a Councell. Again <sup>y</sup>, They object unto us, that by

x Def. ca. 10. lib. 3.  
de verb. Dei. S. 1. am.  
pa. 1450.

y Ibid. 9. dis. pd.  
1451.

the Church we understand the Pope, *Non abnuo*, I confesse we meane so in deed, This is plaine dealing: by the Church they meane the Pope. So *Gregorie de Valentia*<sup>2</sup>, By the name of the Church we understand the head of Church; that is, the Pope. So *Bozius*<sup>3</sup>, The Pope *universorum personam sustinet*, susteineth the person of all Bishops, of all Councils, of all the whole Church, he is in stead of them all. As the whole multitude of the faithfull is the Church formally, and the generall Council is the Church representatively, so the Pope also is the Church virtually, as sustaining the person of all, and having the power, vertue, and authoritie of all, both the formall and representative Church; and so the Churches or Councils judgement, is the Popes judgement; and the Churches or Councils infallibility, is in plaine speech, the Popes infallibility.

10. This will further appeare by those comparisons, which they make betwixt the Church, or Councils, and the Pope. It is the assertiō of Card. *Bellarmino*<sup>4</sup>, as also of their best writers, that there is as much authoritie *Intensivè*, in the Pope alone, as in the Pope with a generall Council, or with the whole Church; though *Extensivè* it is more in them, then in him alone: Even as the light is *Intensivè*, & for degrees of brightnes, as great in the Sun alone, as in it with all the Starres, though it is *Extensivè* more in the, that is, more diffused, or spread abroad into moe, being in them, then in the Sun alone; Neither onely is all the authoritie, which either Council or Church hath, in the Pope, but is in a far more eminent manner in him, then in them. In him it is *Primitively*, or originally, as water in the fountaine, or as light in the Sun; *Omnis auctoritas est in uno*, saith *Bellarmino*<sup>4</sup>, seeing the government of the Church is Monarchicall, all ecclesiasticall power is in one, (he meanes the Pope) and from him it is derived unto others. In the Council, and the rest of the Church, it is but derivatively, borrowed from the Pope, as waters in little brookes, or as light in the moone & starres. In him is *Plenitudo potestatis*, as *Innocentius* teacheth<sup>5</sup>, the fulnesse of Ecclesiasticall power and authoritie dwelleth in him, in the rest whether Councils, or Church, it is onely by *Participation*, and measure, they have no more then either their narrow channels can containe, or his holinesse will permit to distill or drop downe upon their heads, from the lowest skirts of his garment. So whatsoever authoritie either Church, or generall Council hath, the same hath the Pope, and that more eminently, and more abundantly then they either have or can have.

11. But for *Infallibilitie* in judgement thats so peculiar to him, that as they teach, neither the Pope can communicate it, unto Church or Council, nor can they receive it, but onely by their connexion or coherence to the Pope, in whom alone it resideth. *Potestas & infallibilitas papalis, est potestas & gratia personalis*, saith *Scapleron*<sup>6</sup>; Papall power and infallibilitie is a personall

gift.

<sup>2</sup> In 2. 2. disp. 1. q. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Lib. 2. de sig. eccl. ca. 21. §. Hic & lib. 14. ca. 16. §. Hic.

b Li 2. de Cons. ca. 13. §. Hec.

c *Omnium qui docēt papam esse supra Concilium. ibid. quos recenset ca. 14. §. ultimum.*

d Lib. 4. de Ron. Rom. ca. 24. §. Secundo.

e *Inn. 3. ca. 1. Cum ex eo. Ex de Penit. & cap. Proposuit et de Concess. prebend.*

f *Relat. Comp. 6. q. 3. art. 5. opin. 5.*



gift, and grace, given to the person of Peter, and his successors; and personall gifts cannot bee transferred to others. In like sort Pighius <sup>g</sup>, *Vni Petro, atque ejus Cathedra, non Sacerdotali quantumcunque Concilio*; the priviledge of never erring in faith, was obtained, by the prayer of Christ, for Peter alone, and his Chaire; not for any Councell, though it be never so great. To the same purpose saith Bellarmine <sup>h</sup>, If a generall Councell could not erre in their sentence, the judgement of such a Councell should be the last, and highest judgement of the Church; but that judgement is not the last, for the Pope may either approve, or reject their sentence. So Bellarmine, professing the Popes onely judgement to be infallible; seeing it alone is the last, and highest, after, and above both Church, and generall Councell. All the infallibility which they have, is onely by reason of his judgement to which they accord, & consent. It hence appeareth, saith Bellarmine <sup>i</sup>, *totam firmitatem, that the whole strength*, and certainty of judgement, which is even in lawfull Councels, is from the Pope, *non partim à Concilio, partim à Pontifice; it is not partlie from the Councell, and partly from the Pope*; it is wholly, and onely from the Pope, and in no part from the Councell. When the Councell, and Pope consent in judgement, saith Gretzer <sup>k</sup>, *omnis infallibilitas Concilij derivatur à Papa; all the infallibility of the Councell is derived from the Pope*: and a little after, when the Pope consenteth with the Councell, *ideo non errat, quia est Papa; bee is therefore free from erring, because he is the Pope*, and not because he consenteth with the Councell. In like sort Melchior <sup>l</sup> Canus; *The strength and firmitude, both of the whole Church, and of Councels, is derived from the Pope*: and againe <sup>m</sup>, In generall Councels, matters are not to bee judged by number of suffrages, but by the waight of them; *Pondus autem dat summi Pontificis autoritas; and it is the Popes gravity, and authority, which gives waight to that part wherunto he inclineth*: If he say it, one hundred Fathers with him are sufficient; but if his assent bee wanting, a thousand, a million, ten thousand millions, *Nulli satis sunt, no number is sufficient*: Nay, if all the whole world be of a contrary judgement to the Pope, yet, as the Canonist <sup>n</sup> tels us, the Popes sentence, *totius orbis placito præsertur; is of more weight and worth, than the judgement of the whole world*: So cleare it is, that all their boasting of the authority, and infallible judgement of the Church, and of generall Councels, wherein they please themselves, more than ever the Iews did in crying <sup>o</sup> to oist, *Templum Domini, the Temple of the Lord*: that all this is nothing else but a Viser, to hide, or actually to draw into mens mindes the Popes infallibility: they having no meaning at all to give, or allow, either to Church, or generall Councell, any infallibility; but onely with a reference to the Pope, to whom alone they annex it as a personall gift, and peculiar prerogative; and who, like those leane and ill favoured King of Pharaoh, hath devoured, and quite swallowed up all the authority, and infallibility, both of Church, and Councels: yet this much

<sup>g</sup> Lib. 6. de Eccl'es.  
Hier. ca. 1. § Et  
quantum.

<sup>h</sup> Lib. 2. de Conc.  
ca. 11. § De secundo

<sup>i</sup> Lib. 4. de Pont.  
ca. 3. § Contra.

<sup>k</sup> Defen. ca. 2. lib. 4  
de Pont. § Responsum

<sup>l</sup> Loc. Theod. lib. 6.  
ca. 7. § Quid.  
<sup>m</sup> Lib. 5. ca. 5.  
§ Non.

<sup>n</sup> Cyprius Com. in  
cap. Operibus.  
pa. 11.

<sup>o</sup> Ier.

<sup>p</sup> Quodam modo  
quodam modo

<sup>q</sup> Quodam modo  
quodam modo  
quodam modo  
quodam modo  
quodam modo

*The popes indomitable  
greater the authority  
world by his.*

much now is evident, that seeing all, who are of their present Ro-  
mane Church, beleeve, and professe the Church, and generall  
Councils to be infallible; & seeing their infallibility is none, but  
onely by adhering, and consenting to the Pope; it necessarily en-  
sueth, that they all, *a fortiori*, doe beleeve, and must professe the  
Pope to be infallible, seeing on his, the infallibility of both the  
other, doth wholly, and solely depend.

12. Let me adde but one other prooffe hereof, taken from  
Supremacy of authoritie and judgement: It is a ruled case in their  
learning, *Si errare non potest, debet esse summus iudex*; He who is in-  
fallible, must be the highest, and last Iudge; and, *Vice versa*, He who  
is the last, and highest judge, must be infallible. Supremacy and infalli-  
bility of judgement are inseparably linked: To whomsoever Su-  
premacy is given, even for that cause infallibility of judgement is  
granted unto him also; for seeing from the last or supreme  
Iudge, there can be no appeale, it were most unjust to binde  
Christians to beleeve his sentence, who might be deceived; most  
unjust to binde them from appealing from a judge that were  
fallible, or from an erroneous judgement. Consider now to  
whom Supremacy of judgement in causes of faith, belongeth: To  
whom else but to the Pope? whereas some dare affirme, faith  
the Canonist<sup>a</sup>, that a Councell is above the Pope; *Falsissimum est*,  
This is most false: The Successor of Peter, saith Stapleton; *Supra*  
*omnes est*, is above all; Bishops, Church, generall Councils; above  
all. The Pope, saith Bellarmine<sup>c</sup>, is simply and absolutely above the  
whole Church, and above a generall Councell. Hee further tels us,  
that this assertion, That the Pope is above a generall Councell, is, not  
only the judgement of all the ancient Schoole Divines, & the common sen-  
tence of their Writers, (of whom he reckoneth thirteene, and, if it  
were fit, three times thirtie might bee scored up with them)  
but that it is the publike doctrine of their Church, decreed in their  
Laterane Synod, under Leo the tenth: There the Councell, saith  
he<sup>d</sup>, *discretè & ex professo docuit, did plainly, and of set purpose teach*,  
the Pope to bee above all Councils: yea, *expressissime & rem definitivè*,  
that Laterane Councell did most expressly define this: and their defini-  
tion hereof, is, *Decretum de fide*, a Decree of faith: for which  
cause, in his Apology, bearing the name of Schulkenius, hee pro-  
fesseth<sup>e</sup>, that this is, *Articulus fidei*, an Article of faith, such as  
every Christian is bound to beleeve, that the Pope is, *Summus*  
*in terris totius Ecclesie Iudex*; the Supreme, last, and highest Iudge  
of the whole Church, here upon earth; which he proves, besides ma-  
ny other authorities, by this very Laterane<sup>f</sup> decree, and by their  
Trent Councell: The words themselves, of those Councils,  
make the matter plaine; in that at the Laterane Councell they  
thus decree; *Solum Romanum Pontificem supra omnia Concilia au-*  
*thoritatem habere*; that the Pope alone hath authority above all Coun-  
cels; and this, they say, is taught, not onely by Fathers, and Coun-  
cels, but by the holy Scriptures; thereby shewing, that in this de-  
cree

<sup>o</sup> Bell. lib. 3. de verb.  
Dei ca. 5. § Quinti  
et lib. 4. de Pont.  
ca. 1. § Denique.  
et lib. 2. de Conc. ca.  
11. § De tercia.  
p Affirmant ejus ju-  
dicium esse ultimum.  
Hinc autem aperte  
sequitur non errare.  
Bell. lib. 2. de Conc.  
ca. 3 § Accedat.

<sup>q</sup> Cupers com. ad  
cap. oportet. pa. 4.  
nu. 33.  
<sup>r</sup> Rel Cont. 6. q. 3.  
art. 5. opin. 10.  
<sup>s</sup> Lib. 2. de Conc. ca.  
17.  
<sup>t</sup> Lib. eod. ca. 14.  
§ Ultima.

<sup>u</sup> Lib. eod. ca. 17.  
§ Denique.  
<sup>x</sup> Lib. eod. ca. 13.  
§ Deinde.

<sup>y</sup> Ca. 6. § Probo.  
pa. 227.

<sup>z</sup> Cap. eodem. § La-  
teran pa. 249.

<sup>a</sup> Sess. 11. pa. 639. b.  
<sup>b</sup> Redum ex  
Scriptura sacre te-  
stimonio, dictu san-  
ctorum patrum  
&c. libid.

cree they explicate & declare the Catholike faith, which is one of the Cardinals notes; to know when a decree is published by a Councell, *sanguam de fide*, as a decree of faith; and they threaten, the indignation of God, and the blessed Apostles, to the gainsayers of their decrees. A censure as heavy as any Anathema, the denouncing whereof, is another of the Cardinals notes, that they proposed this decree, as a decree of faith. In the other at Trent, the Councell teacheth<sup>d</sup>, that unto the Pope is given, *Suprema potestas in universa Ecclesia*, the Supreme power in the whole Church. And this Supremacy is such, that from all Councells, all other Iudges, you may appeale to him, and hee may reverse, adnull, or repeale their judgement, but from him, as being the last, and highest Iudge, as having supreme power, *quæ nulla est major, & cui nulla est equalis*, then which none is greater, and to which none is equal; you may appeale to none, no, not (as some of them teach) unto God himselfe. The reason whereof is plaine; for seeing the Popes sentence in such causes, is the sentence of God, uttered indeed by man; but, *assistente, & gubernante Spiritu*, Gods Spirit assisting, & guiding him therein; if you appeale from him, or his sentence, you appeale even from God himselfe, and Gods sentence. Such sovereignty they give unto the Pope in his Cathedrall judgement. Now because *Infallibility* is essentially, and inseparably annexed to *supremacie* of judgement, it hence evidently ensueth; that as their *Laterane*, and *Trent* Councells (and, with them, all, who hold their doctrine; that is, all, who are members of their present Romane Church,) doe give *supremacie* of authority and judgement, unto the Pope; so with it they give also *infallibility* of judgement unto him; their best Writers professing, their generall Councells defining, and decreeing, their whole Church mainraining him, and his Cathedrall judgement in causes of faith to bee *infallible*, which was the former point that I undertooke to declare.

13. Suffer mee to goe yet one step further. This assertion of the Popes Cathedrall *infallibility* in causes of faith, is, not onely a position of their Church, (which hitherto wee have declared) but it is the very maine ground, and *fundamentall* position, on which all the faith, doctrines, and religion of the present Romane Church, and of every member thereof, doth relie. For the manifesting whereof, that must diligently be remembred, which we before have shewed; that, as when they commend the *infallibility* of the Church, or Councell; they meane nothing else, then the Popes *infallibility*, by consenting to whom, the Church and Councell is infallible; even so, to the point, that now I undertake to shew, it is all one to declare them to teach, that the Church, or generall Councell, is the foundation of faith, as to say, the Pope is the *foundation* thereof, seeing neither the Church, or Councell is such a foundation, but onely by their consenting with, and adhering to the Pope, who is that *foundation*.

14. This sometimes they will not let in plaine termes to profess

c Ibid. p. 340.

d Sess. 14. ca. 7.

no appeale from  
Popes sentence  
appeale from  
God

e Pontifex ut Princeps Ecclesia summus potest retrahere illud iudicium Concilij. Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 18.

§ Dico. Potest approbare vel reprobare. Idem lib. 2. ca. 11.

§ De tertio.

1 Bell. lib. eodem 2. ca. 18. § Præterea.

2 Aug. Triump. de potest. Eccl. q. 6. ar. 8.

h Sententia Concilij cui præest Petrus, est sententia Spiritus sancti. Bell. lib. 3. de verb. Dei. ca. 5.

§ Sextum.

Idem asserere possunt cetera legiti- ma Concilia. Bell. lib. 2. de Conc. ca. 2.

§ Tertium.

1 Bell. lib. 3. de verb. Dei. ca. 10.

§ Decimum.



k Lib. 4. de Pont. ca.  
3. § Secundus.  
l Pref. in lib de  
Pont. § Qua.  
m lsa. 28. 16.  
n Pet. 2. 8.

n Ca. 6. pa. 135.

o Lib. 4. Hier. ca. 6.  
§ Habet.

p Ench. ca. de sum.  
Pont. § Neque.

q Bell. li. 4. de Pont.  
ca. 1. et. 2. de Conc.  
ca. 14. § Ultim.  
et Grez. def. ca. 1.  
lib. 1. de verbis Del.  
pa. 16.

r Lib. de Eccl. milit.  
ca. 10. § Ad hoc.

s Lib. de effect. Sacr.  
ca. 24. § Tertium.

t Lib. 6. de grat. et  
lib. arb. ca. 3. § At  
Catholici.

u Tripl. cont. whit.  
ca. 11. § Venies.  
x Dupl. cont. whit.  
ca. 16. sect. 4.

fesse. Peter, saith Bellarmine<sup>k</sup>, and every one of his successors, *petra, & fundamentum Ecclesie*, is the rocke, and foundation of the Church. In another place<sup>l</sup> he calleth the Pope, that very foundation, of which God prophesied in *Isaiah*, *1<sup>m</sup> lay in the foundation of Sion, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation: Ecce vobis lapidem in fundamentis Sion*, saith Bellarmine, pointing at the Pope; behold, the Pope is this stone, laid in the foundations of Sion: And in his Apology under the name of Schulkenius<sup>n</sup>, he calls these positiōs of the Popes supremacy, *Cardinē fundamentū, & summa fidei Christiana*, the Hinge, the foundation, the very summe of the Christian faith. To the like purpose Pighius calls<sup>o</sup> the Popes judgement, *Principium indubie veritatis*, a principle of undoubted verity; and that he meaneth the last and highest principle, his whole Treatise doth declare. Coster observes<sup>p</sup>, that the Pope is not onely the foundation, but, which is more, the Rock: other Apostles were foundations, other Bishops are pillars of the Church; but Peter, and his Successor, is that solid Rocke, *qua fundamenta ipsa continet, which supporteth all other pillars and foundations*. To this purpose tends that assertion which is so frequent in their mouthes, and writings<sup>q</sup>, that in causes of faith, *ultimum iudicium est summi Pontificis*, the last judgement belongs to the Pope: Now if it bee the last in such causes, then upon it, as on the last, and lowest foundation, must every doctrine of their Church relie; into his judgement it must last of all be resolved; but it, (because it is the last) into any higher judgement, or lower foundation, cannot possibly be resolved.

15. But their most ordinary, and also most plausible way to expresse this, is under the name of the Church, teaching men to rest, and stay their faith on it, although, in very truth, as wee have shewed before, all which they herein say of the Church, doth in right, and properly belong to the Pope onely, and to the Church but onely by reason of him, who is the head thereof: The tradition of the Scriptures, and all doctrines of faith whatsoever, doe depend of the testimony of the Church, saith Bellarmine. Again, The certainty of all ancient Councils, and of all doctrines, doth depend on the authority of the present Church: And yet more fully<sup>r</sup>, The faith which Catholikes have, is altogether certaine, and infallible: for what they beleeve, they doe therefore beleeve it, because God hath revealed it; and they beleeve God to have revealed it, *quoniam Ecclesiam ita dicentem, vel declarantem, audiunt*; because they heare the Church telling them, that God revealed it. So Bellarmine<sup>s</sup>, who plainly professeth the testimony of the present Church, that is, of the Pope, to bee the last reason, why they beleeve any doctrine; and so the very last, and lowest foundation, on w<sup>ch</sup> their faith doth relie. None more plentifull in this point, than Stapleton; The externall testimony of the Church, saith he<sup>u</sup>, *Fundamentum quoddam fidei nostra verē & propriē est*, is truly and properly a foundation of our faith. Again<sup>x</sup>, the voyce of the Church, *est regula am-*

nium qua creduntur, the rule and measure of all things which are beleeved. Again<sup>e</sup>, whatsoever is beleeved by the Catholike faith, wee Catholikes beleeve that, *propter Ecclesie auctoritatem*, by reason of the Churches authority: we beleeve the Church, *sanctam Medium credendi omnia*, as the Medium or reason why we beleeve all other things: And yet more fully in his doctrinall principles; when we professe in our Creed to beleeve the Catholike Church, the sense hereof, though perhaps not Grammaticall, (for the Pope and his divinity is not subject to Grammer rules) yet certainly the Theologicall sense is this, *Credo illa omnia que Deus per Ecclesiam me docuit*; I beleeve all those things which God hath revealed, and taught mee by the Church. But how know you, or why beleeve you this, *Deum per Ecclesiam revelare*; that all those things which the Church teacheth, are revealed and taught of GOD? What say you to this, which is one peece of your Creed? To this Stapleton, both in that place<sup>b</sup>, and againe in his Relections<sup>c</sup>, gives a most remarkable answer; This, (that God revealeth those things by the Church,) is no distinct Article of faith, *sed est quoddam transcendens fidei Axioma atque principium, ex quo, & hic, & alij omnes Articuli deducuntur*, but this is a transcendent Maxime, and principle of faith, upon which, both this is owne selfe, (note this especially) and all other Articles of faith doe depend: upon this all Articles of faith doe hang, *hoc unum presupponunt*, they all presuppose this, and take it for granted. This, and much more hath Stapleton.

y Tripl. ca. 16.

§ At qui.

x Relect. Cont. 4 q. 1 art. 3. ad 8.

a Dppl. Prin. lib. 8. ca. 21 § Hic.

b Ca. Eod. § Ad se-

cundam.

c Ref. Cont. 4 q. 3. art. 2. ad 2.

All Articles of faith  
depend on the Church.

16. But what speake I of Bellarmine or Stapleton, though the latter hath most diligently sifted this cause? This position, that the Church is the last Iudge, and so the lowest foundation of their faith, is the decreed doctrine of their Trent Councell, and therefore the consenting voyce of their whole Church, and of every member thereof: For in that Councell<sup>d</sup>, the Church is defined to bee the Iudge of the sense; and interpretation of the Scriptures: and by the like reason it is to judge of traditions, and of the sense of them. Now because all doubts and controversies of faith, depend on the one of these, it clearly followeth upon that decree, that the very last stay in all doubts of faith, is the Churches judgement; but that, upon no other, nor higher stay, doth, or can relie; for whatsoever you take besides this, the truth, the waight, and validity of all must be tried in the Church, at her judgement it must stand or fall; yea, if you make a doubt of the Churches judgement it selfe, even that, as all other, must be ended by the judgement of the Church; it is the last Iudge of all. This, to bee the true meaning of the Trent Councel, Bellarmine both saw, and professeth, when hee saith<sup>e</sup>, *The Church, that is, the Pope, with a Councell, is Iudge of the sense of the Scripture, & omnium controversarum, and of all controversies of faith*; and in this all Catholikes do agree, and it is expressly set downe in the Trent Councell: So Bellarmine testifying this to be, both the decreed doctrine of their generall

d Sess. 4. § Præterea.

e Lib. 3. de verbis Dei. ca. 3. § Tota

generall and approved Councell, and the consenting judgment of all that are Romane Catholikes.

17. Now all this which they have said of the Church, if you will have it in plaine termes and without circumloquution, belongs onely to the Pope, who is *versually* both Church and Councell. As the Church or Councell is called infallible, no otherwise but by a *Synechdoche*, because the Pope, who is the head both of Church and Councell, is *infallible*: So is the Church or Councell called the foundation of faith, or last principle on which their faith must relie, by the same figure *Synechdoche*, because the Pope who is the head of them both, is the *foundation* of faith. And whosoever is a true Romane Catholike or member of their present Church, hee beleeveth all other doctrines, because the Church, that is, the Pope doth teach them; and the Pope to teach them *infallibly*, he beleeveth for it selfe, because the Pope faith hee, is in such teaching *infallible*. This *infallibility* of the Pope is the *expozition* *180* the very corner stone; the foundation stone, the rocke and fundamentall *posi*tion of their whole faith and religion, which was the point that I purposed to declare.

18. I have hitherto declared, and I feare too abundantly, that the assertion of the Popes *Cathedrall* infallibilitie in causes of faith, is not onely a *posi*tion, but the very fundamentall *posi*tion of all the doctrines of the present Romane Church. In the next place we are to prove that this *posi*tion is *hereticall*, and that for such it was adjudged and condemned by the Catholike Church. In the prooffe whereof I shall not need to stay long. This whole treatise, and even that which hath already beene declared touching the *Constitution* of Pope *Vigilius* doth evidently confirme the same. For seeing the defending of the *Three Chapters* hath been proved to be *hereticall*, the *Constitution* of *Vigilius* made in defence of those Chapters, must of necessity be confessed to be *hereticall*. Nay if you well consider, you shall see, that this very *posi*tion of the Popes *Cathedrall* infallibilitie, is adjudged to be *hereticall*. For the fift generall Councell knew this cause of the *Three Chapters* to be a *cause of faith*. They knew further that Pope *Vigilius* by his *Apostolicall* decree, and *Cathedrall* Constitution had defined that those *Three Chapters* ought to be defended. Now seeing they knew both these, and yet judicially defined the defence of those *Three Chapters* to be *hereticall*, and for such accursed it, even in doing this, they define the *Cathedrall* judgement of *Vigilius* in this *cause of Faith*, to be *hereticall*, and therefore most certainly and *a fortiori* define this *posi*tion [That the Popes *Cathedrall* sentence in a cause of faith is *infallible*] to be *hereticall*, and for such they anathematize both it, and all that defend it. And because the judgement and definitive sentence of the fift Councell is consonant to all former, and confirmed by all subsequent Councells till the *Laterane* Synod under *Leo* the tenth, it unavoydably hence ensueth, that the same *posi*-

*This position  
hereticall:*

f. ca. 3. & 4.



tion of the Popes Cathedrall infallibility in causes of faith, is by the judgement of all generall Councells untill that time, that is, by the constant and uniforme consent of the whole Catholike Church, adjudged, condemned, and accursed for hereticall, and all who defend it for heretikes. And seeing we have cleerly proved the whole present Romane Church, and all that are members thereof, to defend this position, yea to defend it as the maine foundation of their whole faith; the evidence of that assertion which I proposed, doth now manifestly appeare: *That* <sup>Sup. loc. cap. xv. 6.</sup> *none can now assent to the Pope, or to the doctrines of the present Church of Rome, but he is, eo nomine, even for that very cause, adjudged and condemned for hereticall, and that even in the very ground and foundation of his faith.*

From the foundation let us proceed to the walls and roofe of their religion. Think you the foundation thereof is onely hereticall, and the doctrines which they build thereon orthodoxall? Nothing lesse; They are both sutable, both hereticall. That one fundamentall position is like the Trojan horse, in the wombe of it are hid many troopes of heresies. If *Liberius* confirme Arianisme, *Honorius* Monothelitisme, *Vigilius* Nestorianisme, these all by vertue of that one assertion must passe current for Catholike truths. Nay, who can comprehend, I say not in words, or writing, but in his thought, and imagination all the blasphemous and hereticall doctrines, which by all their Popes have beene, or if as yet they have not, which hereafter may be by succeeding Popes defined to bee doctrines of faith? Seeing *Stapleton* assures us, *That the Church of this, or any succeeding age may put into the Canon and number of sacred and undoubtedly Canonickall bookes; the booke of Hermas called Pastor, and the Constitutions of Clement:* the former being, as their owne notes censure it, *hæresibus & fabulis oppletum, full of heresies and fables,* rejected by Pope *Gelasius* with his Romane Synod, the later being stuffed also with many impious doctrines, condemning <sup>lawfull</sup> marriage as fornication; and allowing <sup>lawfull</sup> fornication as lawfull; with many the like impieties, which in *Passerine* are to bee seene together, for which cause they are worthily rejected in the Canons of the first Councell; seeing the Pope may canonize these; what blasphemies, what heresies, what lies may not with them be canonized? why may not their very Legend in the next Session bee declared to be Canonickall? And yet by that fundamentall position, they are bound (and now doe *implicite*) beleee whatsoever any Pope either by word or writing, either hath already, or shall at any time hereafter define to be a doctrine of faith. Because I will not stay on particulars, if any please seriously to consider this matter, hee shall perceive (that which now I intend to prove) such venome of infidelity to lye in that one fundamentall position of the Popes Cathedrall infallibility, that by reason of holding it, they neither doe nor can beleee or hold with certaintie of faith,

R

any

h Lib. 9. doct. prin.  
ca. 14. 5. Manes.

i Note in lib. Hermas. 10. 5. Bibl. S. patr.  
k Concil. Rom. prima sub Gelasio.  
m Const. Clem. lib. 3. ca. 1.  
n Idem lib. 3. ca. 12.  
o Bipl. in verbo Clemens Rom.  
p Can. 2.

any one point or doctrine, which they professe to beleewe, and hold upon that *Foundation*.

20. For the clearing of which point (being very materiall) it is to be observed, that unto certainty of faith, two things are of necessity required; The one *ex parte objecti*, on the part of thing beleewed, which must be so true and certaine in it selfe, that it cannot possibly bee or have beene otherwise then it is beleewed to be, to have beene, or to be hereafter. And therefore none can truly beleewe any untruth, for nothing which is untrue, is or can be the object of faith. The other thing is required, *ex parte subiecti*, on the part of him who beleeveth. Now faith being onely of such things as are inevident, that is, which neither by sense can be perceived, nor by naturall reason collected or found out, but which are opely by the testimonie of such as first knew them, made knowne unto us, and none doth or can know that which is supernaturall, unlesse God himselfe reveale the same unto him; it hence followeth that whatsoever is by any beleewed, the same is revealed and testified to him by God himselfe, who is infallible: and further, that it is certainly knowne unto him who beleeveth, that it is God himselfe, who doth reveale and testify that thing unto him. For otherwise though the doctrine proposed, be in it selfe never so certaine and divine, yet unto thee, or me, it cannot be certaine, nor held by certainty of faith, unlesse first we be sure and infallibly certaine, that he who testifieth it unto us is himselfe infallible, that is, that he is God. Let us for perspicuity, call the former of these two, *materiale fidei*, the materiall in faith or the thing beleewed: and the later, *formale fidei*, that which is formall in faith, seeing as the former is the thing beleewed, so the later contains the reason, the ground or foundation upon which, and for which it is beleewed.

21. Consider now first the *materials* in their faith. In them there is a great difference; for some of them are in themselves credible, as being divine truths, and true objects of faith. Such are all those Catholike truths common to us and them, as that there is a *Trinity*, that *Christ was borne of a Virgin*, dyed, rose againe, and the like. Others are in themselves untrue, such as cannot be the object of faith: Of this sort are all those doctrines where in they dissent from us, *Transubstantiation*, *reall and proper sacrifice*, *worshipping of Images*, *Purgatory*, *Iustificatiō* by the merit or dignity of our works, and the like, which may rightly bee called popish doctrines. The later sort of these they neither *do* nor *can beleewe*. The former they *might*, but they *do not beleewe*. The reason whereof will appeare by considering that which is formall or the fundamentall ground of their faith: where it is first to be observed, that a man may hold many, yea all the doctrines professed by the present Church, except that one of the Popes *Cathedrall infallibility*, and yet bee no *Papist* or member of their present Church. For although the things professed, or the *Materials*

terialls be the selfe same, yet the formalitie or diverse reason of holding them, causeth a maine difference in the parties that hold them. And for our present purpose it may suffice to note three divers wayes, whereby their doctrines are or may be held.

22. The first is, of them, who build all those doctrines upon the *Scripture* as the *Foundation* thereof: upon that ground, holding not onely many Catholike truths, which they most firmly beleeve, the Church inducing, the *Scriptures* outwardly teaching, and the holy Spirit inwardly sealing, the same unto them: but together with those truths hold some errors also of the *Romane Church* (take for example *Transubstantiation*;) which although for the inducement of that present Church wherein they live, they thinke to be taught in the *Scriptures*, and therefore hold and professe them, and thinke they beleeve them, yet because they are neither in truth taught in the *Scriptures*, nor sealed by Gods Spirit unto their hearts, therefore they hold not these; nor in truth can they hold them with that firmnesse and certainty of faith, as they doe the former truths, but they have a faintnes and feare in their assent unto these, and so a readines and willing preparation of heart, to disclaime these, and to hold or professe the contrary, if ever it may be fully cleared & manifested out of the *Scriptures* unto them. Of this sort we doubt not but many thousands of our fathers were, who living in the darknesse & thicke mists of their Antichristian superstition, upon the *Scriptures* & word of God which they held for the foundation of their faith, builded indeed much gold & precious stones, but with a mixture of much hay, stubble & drosse, thinking (but very erroneously) the later as well as the former to be contained in that *foundation*. The state of all these is very like to *S. Cyprians*, and those other Africane Bishops, which were so earnest for *Rebaptization*, supposing it to be taught in the *Scriptures*, & though the *foundation* of it, & of those catholike truths that Christ was God, or the like, was one and the same unto them, yet they held not both with like firmnes & certainty of faith. The doctrine of Christs deity & manhood they so beleeved, that they would not communicate with any that denied this, nay they would rather die then deny it. But *Rebaptization* they so held, as not thinking their opposites to be heretikes, nor refusing to communicate with the that denied it, so they held this with a certaine faintnes of faith, or rather (as indeed it was) of opinion and not of faith, having a preparation in heart to beleeve, and professe the contrary, if it might at any time, be made manifest unto them. This *S. Austen* often witnesseth of *Cyprian*, *Satis ostendit se facillime correcturum*, he sufficiently declareth that hee would most easily have altered his opinion, if any would have demonstrated the truth unto him. Again<sup>e</sup>, That holy man *Cyprian*, being *non solum doctus; sed docilis, not onely learned, but willing to learne*, and who sets this among the prayes of a Bishop,

R 2

that

*p. Macrescriptum, nemini prescribentes, aut praedictantes quo minus unusquisque quod putaverit faciat, habens liberam arbitrii sui facultatem. Nos autem cum Collegis nostris non contendimus, cum quibus divinum & dominicam pacem tenemus. Cyp. Epist. ad Iubaian. in fine. vid. August. lib. 5. de Baptis. ca. 17. q. Lib. 2. de Baptis. ca. 4. r. Lib. 4. ca. 5.*



Lib. 1. ca. 18.

that hee ought not onely to teach with knowledge, but learne with patience, hee I doubt not would readily have demonstrated not onely how learned, but how willing to learne himselfe had beene, had this question in his life time beene debated, by such learned and holy men, as afterwards it was, I often admire that one observation, among many, which the same *Augustine* makes touching this error in *Cyprian*, of whom being so very learned, he saith, *Propterea non vidit aliquid ut per eum aliud eminentius videretur*; He therefore saw not this one truth touching Rebaptization, that others might see in him a more eminent and excellent truth. And what truth is that? In him we may see the truth of Humilitie, the truth of modestie, the truth of Charitie and ardent love to the peace, and unie of the Church: but the most excellent truth that I can see, or as I thinke, can be seene in erring *Cyprian* is this, that one may be a true Catholike, a Catholike Bishop, a pillar of Gods Church, yea even a Saint and glorious Martyr, and yet hold an error in faith, as did that holy Catholike Bishop, and blessed Martyr Saint *Cyprian*. To him then and the other Africane Bishops, who in like sort erred as he did, may fitly be compared the state of those servants of God, who in the blindness and invincible ignorance of those times of Antichrist, together with many golden truths, which they most firmly beleaved, upon that solid foundation of the Scriptures, held either *Transubstantiation*, or the like errors, thinking them (as *Cyprian* did, of Rebaptization) to be taught in that foundation also. They erred in some doctrines of faith, as *Cyprian* did: yet notwithstanding those errors, they may be Catholikes, and blessed as *Cyprian* was, because they both firmly beleaved many Catholike truths, and their error was without pertinacie as *Cyprians* was. For none, who truly beleaves the Scripture, and holds it for the foundation of his faith, can with pertinacie hold any doctrine repugnant to the Scripture, seeing in his very beleaving of the Scripture, and holding it as the foundation, he doth in truth, though *implicitè*, and *in radice*, as I may say, beleave the flat contrarie to that error, which *explicitè* he professeth. And because he doth *implicitè* beleave the contrarie thereof, he hath, (even all the time while he so erreth) a readinesse and preparation of hart to professe the contrarie whensoever out of the Scripture it shall bee deduced and manifested unto him.

23. A second way of holding those doctrines, is of them, who together with the truths, hold the errors also of their Church, *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatorie*, or the like, thinking them to bee taught in Scriptures, as did the former, but adding obstinacie, or pertinacie to their holding of them, which the former did not. And their pertinacie is apparant hereby, if either they will not yeeld to the truth, being manifested out of the Scriptures unto them, or if before such manifestation, they be so addicted and wedded to their owne wills, and conceits, that

that they resolve either not to heare, or if they doe heare, not to yeeld to the evidence of reason, when they are convinced by it. For it is certaine, that one may bee truly pertinacious not only after conviction, and manifestation of the truth, but even before it also, if he have a resolution not to yeeld to the authority, and weight of convincing reasons. Of this sort were all those who ever since their second *Nicen* Synod (about which time, the Romane Church made their first publike defection from the true and ancient faith) tooke part with that faction in the Church, which maintained the *adoration* of Images, and after that, *Deposing* of Princes, then *Transubstantiation*, and other like heresies, as they crept by degrees into the Church, in severall ages. From that time untill *Leo* the tenth, the Church was like a confused lump, wherein both gold and drosse were mingled together: or like a great Citie infected with the plague. All as well the sicke as sound, lived together within the walls, and bounds of that Citie, but all were not infected; and of those that were; not all alike infected, with those hereticall diseases which then raigned, & more, and more prevailed in the Church. Some openly, and constantly withstood the corruption, and heresies of their time, and being worthy Martyrs, sealed with their blood that truth which they professed. Others dissented from the same errors, but durst not with courage, and fortitude oppose themselves; such as would say to their friends in private: Thus 'I would say in the schooles and openly, *sed maneat inter nos, diversum sentio, but keepe my counsell, I thinke the contrarie*. Many were tainted with those *Epidemicall* diseases by the very contagion of those with whom they did converse, but that strong Antidote in the foundation, which preserved *Cyprian* and the *Africane* Bishops, kept from their hearts, and at last overcame all the poyson wherewith they were infected. Onely that violent, and strong faction, which pertinaciously adhered to the hereticall doctrines, which then sprung up, (the head of which faction was the Pope) and who preferred their owne opinions, before the truth, out of the Scriptures manifested unto them, and by some Councils, also decreed, as namely by that at *Constantinople* in the time of *Constantinus Iconomachus*, and that at *Frankford*, these I say who wilfully and maliciously resisted, yea persecuted the truth and such as stood in defence of it, are those, who are ranked in this second order, who though they are not in proprietic of speech to bee called Papists, yet because the errors which they held are the same, which the Popish Church now maintaineth, they are truly and properly to be tearmed *Popish Hereticks*.

24. The third way of holding their doctrines, beganne with their *Lateran* decree, under *Leo* the tenth, at which time they held the same doctrines which they did before, but they held the now upon another *Foundation*. For the they cast away the old

and sure *Foundation*, and laid a new one of their owne in the roome thereof, The Popes word, in stead of Gods, and Antichrists in stead of Christs. For although the Pope long before that time, had made no small progresse in Antichristianisme, first in usurping an universall authority over all Bishops, next in upholding their impious doctrines of *Adoration* of Images, and the like, and after that in exalting himselfe above all Kings and Emperors, giving and taking away their Crownes at his pleasure, yet the height of the Antichristian myserie consisted in none of these, nor did he ever attaine unto it, till by vertue of that Laterane decree he had justified out Christ and his word, and laid himselfe and his owne word in the stead thereof, for the *Rocke & Foundation* of the Catholike faith. In the first, the Pope was but Antichrist *nascent*; In the second, Antichrist *erect*; In the third, Antichrist *regnant*; but in this fourth, he is made Lord of the Catholike faith, and Antichrist *triumphant*; set up as God in the Church of God, ruling, nay tyrannizing, not onely in the externall and temporall estates, but even in the faith, and Consciences of all men; so that they may beleve neither more, nor lesse, nor otherwise then he prescribeth, nay that they may not beleve the very Scriptures themselves, and word of God, or that there are any Scriptures at all, or that there is a God, but for this reason, *ipse dixit*, because he saith so, and his saying, being a *Transcendent principle of faith*, they must beleve for it selfe, *quia ipse dixit*, because he saith so. In the first, and second, hee usurped the authority and place but of Bishops; in the third, but of Kings; but in making himselfe the *Rocke and Foundation* of faith, he intrudes himselfe into the most proper office and prerogative of Iesus Christ, For *other foundation can no man lay, then that which is laid, Iesus Christ*.

35. Here was now quite a new face of the Romane Church, yea, it was now made a new Church of it selfe, in the very essence thereof distinct from the other part of the Church, and from that which it was before. For although most of the *Mysterialls*, as *Adoration* of Images, *Transubstantiation*, and the rest, were the same, yet the *Formalitie* and foundation of their faith and Church was quite altered. Before they beleaved the Pope to doe rightly, in decreeing *Transubstantiation*, because they beleaved the Scriptures, and word of God, to teach and warrant that doctrine; but now *vice versa* they beleave the Scriptures, and word of God, to teach *Transubstantiation*, because the Pope hath decreed and warranted the same. Till then one might be a good Catholike, and member of their Church, such as were the Bishops in the generall Councils of *Constance* and *Basill*, and those of the first, sixth, seventh, and succeeding Councils, and yet hold the Popes *Catholike* judgement in causes of faith to be not onely *fallible*, but *hereticall* and accursed, as all those Councils did. But since *Supremacie*, and with it *Infalibilitie* of judgement,

Antichrist *nascent*  
*erect*  
*regnant*  
*triumphant*

1 Cor. 3. 11.



judgement, is, by their *Laterane* decree, transferred to the Pope: he who now gainsayeth the Popes sentence, in a cause of faith, is none of their Church, as out of *Gregory de Valentia*, he is an *heretike*, as out of *Stapleton*, *Camus*, and *Bellarmino* was declared: He may as well deny all the Articles of his Creed, and every text in the whole Bible, as deny this one point, for in denying it, he doth *confess*, by their doctrine *implicite*, and in effect, deny them all, seeing he rejects that formall reason, for which, and that *foundation* upon which, they are all to be beleaved; and without beleefe of which, not one of them all can be now beleaved. *Art. 26.* These then of this third sort are truly to be counted members of their present *Romane* Church, these, who lay this new, & *Laterane* *fundamentis*, for the ground of their faith, whether *explicite*, as do the learned, or *implicite*, as do the simpler sort in their Church, who wilfully blind-folding themselves, and gladly persisting in their affectate and supine ignorance, either will not use the means to see, or seeing, will not embrace the truth, but content themselves with the *Colliers* *Catechisme*, and wrap up their owne in the Churches faith, saying, *I beleefe as the Church beleeveth*, and the Church beleeveth what the Pope teacheth. All these, and onely these are members of their present Church, unto whom, of all names, as that of *Catholikes*, is most unsutable, and most unjustly arrogated by themselves; so, the name of *Papists*, or, which is equivalent, *Antichristians*, doth most fitly, truly, and in propriety of speech, belong unto them: For seeing *forma dat nomen*, & *esse*, whence rather should they have their essentiall appellation, then from him, who giveth life, formality, and essence to their faith, on whom, as on the *Rocke*, and corner stone, their whole faith dependeth. The saying of *Cassander* to this purpose, is worthy remembring: There are some, faith hee, who will not permit the present state of the Church, though it be corrupted, to be changed, or reformed, and who, *Pontifices Romanum quem Papam dicimus tantum non deum faciunt*, make the Bishop of Rome, whom we call the Pope, almost a god, preferring his authority, not onely above the whole Church, but above the Sacred Scripture, holding his judgement equal to the divine Oracles, and an infallible rule of faith. *Hos non video, cur minus Pseudo-catholicos, et Papias appellare possit*, I see no reason, but that these men should be called *Pseudo-catholikes*, or *Papists*. Thus *Cassander*, upon whose judicious observatio it followeth, that seeing their whole Church, and all the members thereof, preferre the Popes authority above the whole Church above all generall Councils and *quod* *non*, (which is *Cassander* meaning) above the Scriptures also, defending them not to be *hereticall*, but by the authority of the Church, that there is, *multa* *in* *his* *sententia*, much more *heretic* in the Church, than in them, that it is no absurd, may, as may be a pious saying, That the Scriptures without the authority of the Church, are no more worth than *Asops* *Fables*. Seeing they all,

u Sup. hoc cap. nu. 7

x Hof. de author. sac.  
Script. lib. 3.  
§ Quert.

papists no Catholics

y Lib. de offic. viii  
§ Sum. alij.z Ecce potestas Ec.  
cleſie ſupra Script.  
Enchyr. tit. de  
Ecceſ.  
a Enchyr. lib. 1.  
b Tb. Ber. lib. de ſig.  
nu Eccl. 16. ca. 10.  
§ Illud.  
c Non adeo abſurde  
dictum eſt, &c.  
Grete. Appen. 2. ad  
lib. 1. de verb. dei  
pa. 396.  
p Potuit illud pio  
ſenſu dici. Hof. lib. 3.  
de author. Script.  
§ Fingamus.

with

with one consent make the Pope the last, supreme, and *infallible* iudge in all causes of faith; there can bee no name devised more proper and fit for them, than that of Papists; or, which is all one, Antichristians, both which expresse their essentiall dependence on the Pope, or Antichrist; as on the *foundation* of their faith, which name most essentially also differenceth them from all others, which are not of their present Church; especially from true Catholikes, or the Reformed Churches; seeing, as we make Christ and his word, so they on the contrary, make the Pope, that is to say, Antichrist, and his word, the ground and *foundation* of faith: In regard wherof, as the faith & religion of the one is from Christ truly called, Christian, and they truly, Christians; so the faith and religion of the other, is from the Pope, or Antichrist, truly and properly called Papisme, or Antichristianisme, and the professors of it Papists, or Antichristians. And whereas *Bellarmino* glorieth of this very name of Papists, that it doth, *attestari veritati*, gives testimony to that truth which they profess; truly we envy not so apt a name unto them: Onely the Cardinal shews himself a very unskilful Herald in the blazon of this coat, & the descēt of this title unto them. He fetcheth it forsooth frō Pope *Clement*, Pope *Peter*, and Pope *Christ*: Phy, it is of no such antiquity, nor of so honourable a race: Their owne *Bristow* will assure him, that this name was never heard of till the dayes of *Leo the tenth*. Neither are they so called, (as the Cardinall fancieth) because they hold communion in faith with the Pope, which, for fixe hundred yeares and more, all Christians did, and yet were not Papists, nor ever so called; but because they hold the Popes judgement to be supreme, and *infallible*; and so build their faith on him, as on the *foundation* thereof, which their owne Church never did, till the time of *Leo the tenth*. It is not then the Lion of the Tribe of *Judah*, but the Lion of that *Laterane* Synod, who is the first Godfather of that name unto them, when hee had once laid the Pope as the *foundation* of faith in stead of Christ, they who then builded their faith upon this new *foundation*, were fitly christened with this name of Papists, to distinguish them, and their present *Romane* Church from all others, who held the old, good, and true *foundation*.

26. You see now the great diversity which ariseth from the divers manner of holding the same doctrines. The errors maintained by all those three sorts, of which I have spoken, are almost the same; and materially they are Popish heresies; and yet the first sort did onely erre therein, but were not *heretikes*, because not pertinacious. The second doe not onely erre, but by adding pertinacy to errour, are truly *heretikes*; but yet not *Papists*, because they hold those Popish heresies in another manner, and on another foundation then Papists doe. The third, and last sort, which containeth all, and onely those who are members of the present *Romane* Church, doe both erre, and are *heretikes*; and, which

e Lib. de not. Eccl.  
ca. 4.

f Papista deducitur  
a Papa, quatu fuit  
Petrus, & Christus  
ipse. ubi  
d Demand.

600 years no papists  
so called: or styled:

which is the worst degree of heresie, are *Papists*, that is, *Antichristian heretikes*; not onely holding, and that in the highest degree of pertinacy, those heresies which are contrary to the faith, but holding them upon that *foundation* which quite overthroweth the faith.

27. By this now doth the evidence of that truth appeare, which before<sup>a</sup> I proposed, that none who hold the Popes *infallibility* in causes of faith for their *foundation*, (that is, none of the present Romane Church) either doth, or can beleeve any one doctrine of faith, w<sup>ch</sup> they professe: For seeing the beleeve of all other points relies upō this, so that they beleeve thē, because they first beleeve this, it followeth by that true rule of the Philosopher<sup>i</sup>, *Propter quod unumquodq; illud magis*; that they doe more firmly and certainly beleeve this, which is the *foundation*, than they doe, or can beleeve any other doctrine; I say not *Transubstantiation*, or *Purgatory*, but more thā that Article of their *Creed*, that *Christ is God*, or that there is a God, or any the like; which is builded upon this *foundatiō*. And seeing we have cleerly demonstrated that *foundation* to bee, not onely untrue; but hereticall; and therefore such as cannot be apprehended by faith, it being no true object of faith; it doth evidently hence ensue, that they neither doe, nor can beleeve any one doctrine, position or point of faith. Impossible it is, that the rooſe should bee more firme than the *foundation* which supports the roof; or the conclusion more certaine unto us than those premisses which cause us to assent, and make us certaine of the conclusion: That one fundamentall uncertainty, & contrariety to the faith, which is virtually in all the rest, breeds the like uncertainty, and contrariety to faith, in them all; and, like a Radicall poyson, spreads it selfe into the whole body of their religion, infecting every arme, branch, and twigge of their doctrine, and faith; whatsoever error or heresie they maintaine, (and those are not a few) those they neither doe, nor can beleeve, because they are no objects of faith, whatsoever truths they maintaine, (and no doubt they doe many) those they thinke they doe, and they might doe, but indeed they doe not beleeve, because they hold them for that reason, and upon that *foundation* which is contrary to faith, and which overthroweth the faith: For to hold or professe that *Christ is God*, or that there is a God, *eo nomine*, because the Devill, or Antichrist, or a fallible man testifieth it unto us, is not truly to beleeve, but to overthrow the faith.

28. This may be further cleared by returning to our example of *Vigilius*. If, because the Pope judicially defineth a doctrine of faith, they doe therefore beleeve it, then must they beleeve Nestorianisme to be the truth, and Christ not to bee God, because Pope *Vigilius*, by his judiciall and *Apostolicall* sentence, hath decreed this, in decreeing that the *three Chapters*, are to be desēded: If they beleeve not this, then can they beleeve nothing at all,

<sup>i</sup> Sap. nu. 19.

<sup>i</sup> Arist. lib. 1. demon. 64. 2.

no faith: to beleeve  
god is: or of christ is  
god: eo nomine be-  
lieve or Antichrist  
testifieth it



*eo nomine*, because the Pope hath defined it; and then the *foundati-*  
*on* of their faith being abolished, their whole faith, together  
 with it, must needs be abolished also. Againe, if because the  
 Pope defineth a doctrine, they doe therefore beleeve it; then  
 seeing Pope *Celestine*, with the *Ephesine*, and Pope *Leo*, with the  
*Chalcedon* Councell, decreed Nestorianisme to be heresie, they,  
 by the strength of their fundamental positio<sup>n</sup> of the Popes *infalli-*  
*bility*, must, at one and the same time, beleeve, both Nestoria-  
 nisme to be truth, as Pope *Vigilius* defined, and Nestorianisme  
 to be heresie, as Pope *Celestine* and *Leo* defined; and so they must  
 either beleeve two contradictories to be both true, yea, to bee  
 truths of the Catholike faith, which, to beleeve, is impossible, or  
 else they must beleeve, that it is impossible to beleeve, either the  
 one or the other, *eo nomine*, because the Pope hath defined it, and  
 so beleeve it to bee impossible to beleeve that, which is the  
*foundation* of their whole faith. Neither is this true onely in o-  
 ther points, but even in this very *foundation* it selfe: for the fifth  
 Councell, which decreed the Cathedrall and *Apostolicall* sen-  
 tence in the cause of the *Three Chapters*, to be hereticall, was ap-  
 proved by the decrees of Pope *Gregory*, *Agatho*, and the rest, unto  
*Leo* the tenth. If then they beleeve a doctrine to be true, because  
 the Pope hath defined it, then must they beleeve the Popes *Ca-*  
*thedral* sentence in a cause of faith, to bee, not onely falli-  
 ble, but hereticall; and so beleeve, that upon this fallible and  
 hereticall *foundation*, they can build no doctrine of faith,  
 nor hold thereupon anything with certainty of faith: So, if the  
 Pope in defining such causes be *fallible*, then, for this cause, can  
 they have no faith, nor beleeve ought with certainty of faith,  
 seeing all relies upon a *fallible foundation*. If the Pope, in defining  
 such causes, be *infallible*, then also can they have no faith, seeing,  
 by the infallible decrees of Pope *Gregory*, *Agatho*, and the rest  
 unto *Leo* the tenth, the Popes Cathedrall sentence in a cause  
 of faith, may bee hereticall, as this of Pope *Vigilius*, by their  
 judgement, was: So, whether the Pope in such causes, be *falli-*  
*ble*, or *infallible*, it infallibly followeth upon either, that none  
 who builds his faith upon that *foundation*, that is, none who are  
 members of their present Romane Church, can beleeve, or hold  
 with certainty of faith, any doctrine whatsoever, which he pro-  
 fesseth to beleeve.

29. Here I cannot chuse, but, to the unspeakable comfort of  
 all true beleevers, observe a wonderfull difference betwixt us,  
 and them, arising from that diversitie of the *foundation*, which  
 they and we hold; their *foundation* being not onely uncertaine,  
 but *hereticall* and Antichristian, poysoneth all which they build  
 thereon; it being vertyually in them all, makes them all, like it  
 selfe, uncertaine, hereticall, and Antichristian; and so those very  
 doctrines, which, in themselves, are most certaine, and ortho-  
 doxall, by the uncertainty of that ground, upon which, and for  
 which

which they are beleaved, are overthrowne, with us, and all Catholikes it falls out otherwise. Though such happen to erre in some one, or moe doctrines of faith, (say, in *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, or, as *Cyprian* did, in *Rebaptization*) yet seeing they hold those errors, because they thinke them to be taught in the Scriptures, and Word of God, on which alone their faith relyeth; most firmly, and undoubtedly beleevving whatsoever is taught therein; (among which things are the contrary doctrines to *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, & *Rebaptization*: such, I say, even while they doe thus erre in their Explicite profession; doe truly, though *implicitely*, by consequent, and *in radice*, or *fundamento*, beleevve, and that most firmly, the quite contrary to those errors, which they doe outwardly professe, and think they doe; but indeed doe not beleevve. The vertue and strength of that fundamentall truth, which they indeed and truly beleevve, overcommeth all their errors, which in very deed they doe not; though they thinke they doe beleevve, whereas, in very truth, they beleevve the quite contrary. And this golden *foundation* in Christ, which such men, though erring in some points, doe constantly hold, shall more prevaile to their salvation, than the Hay and Stubble of those errors, which ignorantly, but not pertinaciously, they build thereon; can prevaile to their destruction: and therefore if such a man happen to die, without explicite notice, and repentance of those errors in particular, (as the saying of Saint *Austen*<sup>k</sup>; that what faults Saint *Cyprian* had contracted by humane imbecillity, the same, by his glorious Martyrdome, was washed away; perswades mee that *Cyprian* did: and as of *Irene*, *Nepos*, *Iustine Martyr*, and others, who held the error of the Chiliaists, I thinke none makes doubt :) it is not to be doubted, but the abundance of this mans faith and love unto Christ, to whom in the *foundation* hee most firmly adhereth, shall worke the like effect in him, as did the blood of martyrdome in Saint *Cyprian*: For the baptisme of martyrdome washeth away sinne, not because it is a washing in blood, but because it restifieth the inward washing of his heart by faith, and by the purging Spirit of God: This inward washing in whomsoever it is found, (and found it is in all who truly beleevve, though in some point of faith they erre) it is as forcible and effectuall to save *Kalentinian*<sup>l</sup>, neither baptized with water, nor with blood; and *Nepos*<sup>m</sup>, baptized with water, but not with blood; as to save *Cyprian*, baptized both with water, and with blood. Such a comfort and happinesse it is to hold the right and true *foundation* of faith.

30. The quite contrary is to be seen in them: Though they explicite professe Christ to be God, which is a most orthodox all truth; yet because they hold this, as all other points, upon that *foundation* of the Popes *infallible* judgement in causes of faith, and in that *foundation* this is denyed, Pope *Vigilius*, by his *Cathedral* Con-

stitution

faith grounded on  
the scriptures  
pope makes it different

k Lib. 1. de baptismo.  
ca. 18.

l Abbaire ascendi;  
qui sua fides lavit,  
Amb. Orat. de obitu  
Valent.  
m Qui jam ad  
quietem processit, an  
Disputat. apud Euseb.  
l. 1. ca. 23.

stitution defining Nestorianisme to be truth, and so Christ not to be God; it must needs be confessed, that even while they doe *explicitè* professe Christ to bee God, they doe *implicitè*, *in radice*, and *in fundamento*, deny Christ to be God, and because, by the Philosophers rule, they doe more firmly beleeve that *foundation*, than they doe, or can beleeve any doctrine depending thereon, it must needs ensue hence, that they doe, and must by their doctrine more firmly beleeve the Negative, that Christ is not God, which in the *foundation* is decreed, then they doe, or can beleeve the Affirmative, that Christ is God, which upon that *foundation* is builded. The truth, which upon that *foundation* they doe *explicitè* professe, cannot possibly be so strong to salvation, as the error of the *foundation*, upon which they build it, will be to destruction: For the fundamentall error is never amended by any truth superedified and laid thereon, no more than the rotten foundation of an house is made sound by laying upon it rafters of gold or silver, but all the truths that are superedified, are ruinated by that fundamentall error and uncertainty on which they all relye, even as the beames and rafters of gold, are ruinated by that rottenness, and unsoundnesse which resteth in the *foundation*: Or if they say, that both the assertions (which are directly contradictory) are from that *foundation* deduced, *Calestine* and *Leo* decreeing the one, that Christ is God, as *Vigilius* decreed the other, that Christ is not God, then doth it inevitably follow, that they can truly beleeve neither the one, nor the other, seeing, by beleeving that *foundation*, they must equally beleeve them both, which is impossible. Such an unhappy, and wretched thing it is, to hold that erroneous, hereticall, and Antichristian foundation of faith.

31. My conclusion of this point is this. Seeing we have first declared, that all who are members of the present Romane Church, doe hold the Popes *Cathedrall infallibility* in causes of faith, yea, hold it as the very *foundation* on which all their other doctrines, faith and religion doth relye; and seeing wee have next demonstrated this to be a fundamentall heresie, and not onely an hereticall, but an Antichristian *foundation*, condemned by Scriptures, by generall Councils, by ancient Fathers, and by the consenting judgement of the whole Catholike Church; that now hence followeth which I proposed to prove, *that none is, or can bee a member of their present Church, but she same is convicted and condemned for an heretike*, by Scriptures, generall Councils, Fathers, and by the uniforme consent of the Catholike Church. An heretike, first, in the very *foundation* of his faith, which being Antichristian is hereticall in the highest, and worst degree that may be, razing the true foundation of faith, in regard whereof the mystery of Antichristianisme farre surpasseth all the heresies that ever went before, or shall ever follow after it. An heretike, secondly, in many particuler doctrines depend-



ding on that *Foundation*, among which are the heresies and blasphemies of the Nestorians, all which by the *Cathedral* constitution of *Figilius*, are decreed to be truths, and by all men to be defended. Lastly, an heretike virtually and *quoad radicem*, in every doctrine of faith which hee holdeth or professeth, and so hereticall therein, that the very holding of Catholike truths becomes unto him hereticall, seeing he holds them upon that *Foundation*, which is not only contrary to faith, but which overthroweth the whole faith. *Reward ° Babylon*, O ye servants of the Lord, as she hath rewarded you, give her double according to her workes, and in the cup that she hath filled to you, fill her the double. From hence there ensueth one other conclusion, which being worthy observing, I may not well omit. And this it is, That in none at all, of their Church, or of the same faith with it, there neither is nor can be (so long as they remaine such) any piety or holinesse, either in their life, or in any of their actions: nor any act which is truly good and acceptable unto God is or can be performed by any of them. For true faith is the *Foundation* and fountaine of all true pietie, and good actions, it being impossible, as the Apostle teacheth, without faith to please God: and, to the unbelievers all things are impure, even their mindes and consciences are defiled; How much more their outward actions, speeches, writings, and thoughts, which all spring from the heart. To this purpose is that in the Prophet *Haggai*: who demandeth of the Priests, If a polluted person (such are all whose hearts are not purified by faith) touch any of these things, either holy bread, or holy wine, or any holy thing, shall it be uncleane? And the Priests answered and said, It shall be uncleane. The pollution of him that toucheth it, pollutes all, even the most holy things that are. Then answered *Haggai*, and said, So is this people, and so is this Nation before me, saith the Lord. So are all the workes of their hands, and that which they offer is uncleane. The same agreeth to those of whom we intreat. The infidelity of their hearts, pollutes all their actions, seeme they never so holy: their almes-deedes and workes of charity, their righteousness, and workes of justice, their fastings, continency, and workes of temperance, their prayers, sacraments, sacrifices, and workes of pietie: the fountaine being poysoned with infidelity, and want of true faith, all the waters, every river, and little brooke derived from it, carrieth the same infection in it, which it tooke at the spring. Saint *Austen* is plentiful in this point: Where the faith is faith he is fained or unsound, non potest ex ea bona vita existeri, there can no good life be or arise from it. In another place he sheweth, that even to keepe ones selfe chaste or continent, and yet to doe this without faith, is a sinne, and that thereby, non peccata coercentur, sed alia peccata alia peccata vincuntur, sinners are not expelled, but one sinne (of intemperancy) is overcome by another sinne, (of continency wanting faith.) To omit many the like, heare what he saith to the Manichees, boasting, as they ° of the Romane Church doe, that they

o Rev. 18. 6.

p Heb. 11. 6.  
q Tit. 1. 15.r Gal. 2. 14. 15. i  
[Ad. 15. 9.]

1 Lib. 5. cont.  
Faust. ca. 11.  
u Lib. 1. de Nap. &  
Contra 3.  
x Potest homo facere  
plus quā Deus pre-  
cipit, quia multa  
magis potest implere  
praeceptum. Bell.  
lib. 4. de Iustif. ca.  
23. §. Accedant &  
Catholici omnes  
decem, legem dei  
iustis hominibus  
esse absolute possi-  
bilem, lib. eod. ca. 20  
g. Porro.

7 Aufl. lib. 5. contra  
Faust. ca. 5.

2 In lib. Infr. divin.  
ca. 6.

2 Lib. eod. ca. 3.

fulfilled the Law. Why doe ye boast so much of fulfilling the Law, and commandments of God? *Quid illa professent omnia ubi non est fides vera, etiamsi vere implerentur a vobis?* What could all the commandments profit you, who have not a true faith, though ye did truly fulfill them all? Thus and much more Saint Austen. Seeing then we have proved, their faith to be not onely unsound but hereticall and Antichristian, (worse then which, the faith of the Manichees could not be:) impossible it is that from such a faith, either true vertue, or any godly act should ever arise. The best that can be said of those which they call good workes, is that which Lactantius saith of the works of the Ethnikes, which like theirs, good substantiam operis, were good. *Umbræ est & imago iustitiæ, quam illi iustitiam putaverunt:* It is but a shadow and shew of justice, which they thinke to be justice. *Omnia doctrina & virtus eorum sine capite est;* all the knowledge and vertue which they have, wanteth the head of true knowledge and vertue. It wanteth true faith in Christ, which is the head of all knowledge, and vertue. This head whosoever wanteth, *Non dubium est, quin impius sit, omnesq; virtutes ejus in illa mortifera via reperiuntur, quæ est tota tenebrarum;* theres no doubt to be made, but such an one is impious, and all the vertues which hee thinkes he hath, are mortiferous and deadly.

Where againe I cannot but observe to the comfort of all true beleevers another exceeding difference betwixt us and them, even in those matters concerning life, and good workes: whatsoever things are either in themselves good, or being of themselves indifferent, are by the lawfull authority either of civil, or ecclesiasticall governours, commanded, we in doing any of those things, and shewing our willing obedience thereunto, performe an act not onely lawfull, but laudable and acceptable unto God. For in doing any of these, we doe virtually performe obedience unto Christ, who by them commandeth the doing of all such things: and in our religious performing of them, we hold firme that holy foundation, not onely of faith, but of good workes, which the scriptures teach. Neither onely are such workes acceptable unto God, but even those acts also which are wicked and ungodly, being committed by such as doe truly beleeve, though they be as heinous as was the crime of David, or the abomination of Pharaoh, even those, I say, by the strength and vertue of that foundation, if one doe rightly hold and beleeve it, are so covered, put away and forgotten, that God seeth none iniquity in David, nor transgression in Israel. Such, so infinite is the goodnesse, and so soveraigne is the vertue which is in holding the true foundation of faith. The contrary of all this falleth out unto them, of the present Romane Church. For not onely their finnes are made more sinfull unto them, there being no meanes to cover, or hide them from the eyes of God, and shield them from his vengeance; but even their best and most holy actions which they doe, or can performe, though they should

doe

doe nothing but sing hymnes with *David*, or feed Christs flock with *Peter*, or give their goods to the poore, and their bodies to be burned for Christ, even these, I say, are so tainted with the venom of that *Apostaticall foundation*, that being of themselves holy actions, yet unto them they are turned into sinne, and become pernicious and mortiferous. For whatsoever act being in it selfe either good or indifferent, any of their Church (except onely the Pope himsele, who is a member transcendent) doth performe, because they doe it in obedience unto him, whose supreme authority they make the *foundation*, not onely of their faith, but of all good actions: in doing any such act, there is a *vertuall* and *implicit* obedience to Antichrist, an acknowledgement of his supreme power to teach and command what is to be done; a receiving his marke, either in their hand or forehead: so that every such act, is not onely impious, but even Antichristian, and containeth in it a *vertuall* and *implicit* renouncing of the whole faith: In regard whereof none can ever sufficiently, I say, not commend, but admire the zeale of *Luther*: who though he was so earnest to have the Communion in both kinds, contrarie to the doctrine and custome of the Romane Church, yet withall hee *professed* that, if the Pope as Pope should command it to be received in both kinds, he then would receive it not in both, but in one kind onely. Blessed *Luther*! it was never thy meaning either to receive it, onely in one, or to deny it to be necessary for Gods Church and people to receive it in both kindes. Thou knewest right well, that *Bibite ex hoc omnes*, was Christs owne ordinance, with which none might dispense; Thou for defence of this truth among many, was set up as a signe of contradiction unto them, and as a marke at which they directed all their darts of malicious and malignant reproaches. Farre was it from thee to relent one hare-bredth in this truth. But whereas they *taught the use of the Cup to be indifferent and arbitrarie*; such as the Church (that is, the Pope) might either allow, or take away, as he should thinke fit: upon this supposall and no otherwise, didst thou in thine ardent zeale to Christ, and detestation of Antichrist, say; that were the use of both or one kinde onely, a thing indeed indifferent, as they taught it to be; if the Pope as Pope should command the receiving in both kindes; thou wouldst not then receive it so, lest whilst thou might seeme to obey Christ commanding that, but yet (upon their supposall) as a thing indifferent, thou shouldst certainly performe obedience to Antichrist, by his authoritie limiting, and restraining that indifferency, unto both kindes, as now by his authority hee restraines it unto one. The summe is this, To doe any act whether in it selfe good, or indifferent, but commanded to be done by the Pope as Pope; to pray, to preach, to receive the Sacraments, yea but to lift your eyes, or hold up your finger, or say your *Pater noster*, or your *Ave Maria*, or wear a bead, a modell, a lace, or any garment white, or blacke, or use any crossing, either at Baptisme, or

*Luthers zeale.*

e Kennit. Exa.  
conc. Trid. 1. Tract.  
de communi. sub m-  
traq; specie. pa. 136.

f Conc. Constant.  
Sess. 13. Conc.  
Trid. Sess. 22. in de-  
creto super petis.  
de concessione calicis  
Bell. lib. 4. de Eu-  
char. ca. 28.



any other time, to do any one of these, or any the like, *eo nomine*, because the Pope, as Pope, teacheth that they are to be done, or commands the doing of them, is in very deed a yielding one selfe to be a vassall of Antichrist, a receiving the mark of the beast, and a vertuall or implicit deniall of the faith in Christ. So extremely venomous is that poison which lyeth in the root of that fundamentall heresie which they have laid as the very rocke and Foundation of their faith.

¶ *Esse schismatici  
convicti sunt, qui  
diversam à Romano  
Pontifice, bis decernendū,  
sententiam  
seclatē essent. Bar.  
an. 547. nu. 30.*

34. Hitherto we have examined the former position of Baroni-  
nus which concerned Heresie. His other concerning Schisme, is  
this: That they who dissented from Pope Vigilius when he decreed  
that the Three Chapters ought to be defended, were Schismatikes. A  
most strange assertion: that the whole Catholike Church  
should bee schismaticall, for they all dissented from Vigilius in  
this cause, that Catholikes should all at once become Schisma-  
tikes, yea and that also for the very defence of the Catholike  
faith. I oppose to this, another and true assertion, That not one-  
ly Pope Vigilius when he defended the Three Chapters, and forsooke  
communion with the condemners of them, was a Schismaticke himselfe,  
and chiefe of the Schisme, but that all who as yet defend Vigilius, that  
is, who maintaine the Popes Cathedrall infallibility in causes of faith,  
and forsake communion with those that condemne it, that those all are,  
and that for this very cause, Schismatikes, and the Pope, the ringlea-  
der in the Schisme.

¶ *In coll. B. talis. anti-  
thema sit. sepelitur.  
i. Nihil aliud signi-  
ficat anathema, nisi  
a Deo separationem.  
Coll. 5. pa. 551. b.  
¶ An. 553. nu. 221.*

¶ *Ibid.*

¶ *An. eodem 553.  
nu. 250.*

¶ *An. eodem nu.  
229.*

35. For the manifesting whereof, certaine it is, that after  
Pope Vigilius had so solemnly, and judicially by his Apostolicall  
authority defined, that the Three Chapters ought to be defended,  
there was a great rent and Schisme in the Church, either part  
separating it selfe from the other, and forsaking communion  
with the other. First, the holy Councell, and they who tooke  
part with it, anathematized the defenders of those Chapters,  
thereby (as themselves expound it) declaring their opposites to  
be separated from God, and therefore from the society of the  
church of God. On the other side, Pope Vigilius & they who were  
on his part, were so averse from the others, that they would ra-  
ther endure disgrace, yea banishment as Baroni<sup>us</sup> sheweth, the  
communicate with their opposites. But I shal not need to stay in  
proving that there was a rent and schisme at this time betwene  
the defenders & condemners of those chapters. Baroni<sup>us</sup> profes-  
seth it, saying, *The whole Church was then schismate dilacerata, torn  
asunder by a schisme.* Again<sup>e</sup>, *After the end of the Councell there a-  
rose a greater war then was before. Catholikes (to he falsly calls both  
parts) being then divided among themselves, some adhering to the  
Councell, others holding with Vigilius and his Constitution.* Again<sup>e</sup>,  
*Many relying upon the authority of Vigilius, did not receive the fifth  
Synod, atq; a contraria illis sententiis sese dividerunt, and separated  
or divided themselves from those who thought the contrary.* Such were  
the Italian, Africaine, Illirian, & other neighbour Bishops. So Bar-

roni<sup>us</sup>:

*ronius*: truly professing a schisme to have bin then in the Church, and Pope *Vigilius* to have beene the leader of the one part.

36. But whether of these two parts were Schismatickes? As the name of heresie, though it bee common to any opinion, whereof one makes choice, whether it be true or false, (in which sense *Constantine* the great, called the true faith, *Catholicam & sanctissimam haresim*) yet in the ordinarie use it is now applied only to the choice of such opinions, as are repugnāt to the faith: So the name of Schisme though it import any scissure or renting of one from another, yet now by the vulgar use of Divines, it is appropriated onely to such a rent or division as is made for an unjust cause, and from those, to whom, hee or they who are separated, ought to unite themselves & hold communion with them. This, whosoever doe, whether they bee moe, or fewer then those from whom they separate themselves, they are truly and properly to bee termed Schismatickes, and factious. For it is neither multitude, nor paucitie, nor the holding with, or against any visible head, or governour whatsoever, nor the bare act of separating ones selfe from others; but only the cause, for which the separation is made, which maketh a Schisme or faction, and truly denounceth one to be factious, or a Schismaticke. If *Elijah* separate himselfe from the foure hundreth *Baalites* and the whole kingdome of *Israel*, because they are Idolaters; and they sever themselves from him because he wil not worship *Baal*, as they did; If the three children for the like cause; separate themselves from all the Idolatrous Babylonians, in separation they are both like, but in the cause being most unlike, the *Baalites* onely, and not *Elijah*, and the Babylonians only, and not the three children, are Schismatickes. Now because every one is bound to unite himselfe to the Catholike and orthodoxall Church, and hold communion with them in faith, hence it is that, as out of *Austine*<sup>h</sup> *Stapleton* rightly observes, *Tota ratio Schismatis*, the very essence of a Schisme consists in the separating from the Church, I say from the true & orthodoxall Church, for as Saint *Augustine* in the same place teacheth, whosoever differs from the Scriptures, and so from the true faith, though they be spred throughout the whole world, yet such are not in the (sound) Church, much lesse are they the Church. And therefore from them, be they never so many, never so eminent, one may, and must separate himselfe. But if any sever himselfe from the orthodoxall Church, or, to speake in *Stapletons* words, *se-  
mit operari in ratione fidei ut pars ecclesia catholica*, if he will not cooperate or joyne together in maintaining the faith, as a member of the Catholike or orthodoxall Church; *Schismaticus hoc ipso est*, hee is for this very cause a Schismaticke.

o *Epist. ad Cressum*  
apud *Euseb. lib. 10.*  
ca. 5.

*schismaticke*

h *Lib. de unit. Eccl.*  
ca. 4.  
i *Lib. 6. de b. p. m.*  
ca. 7. §. 1. fud.

h *Lib. 10. ca. 7. §.*  
*Nempe.*

37. Apply now this to *Vigilius* and the fift generall Council, and the case will be cleare. The onely cause of separation on the Councils part, was, for that *Vigilius* with all his adhe-

1711.3.10.

rents were Heretikes, convicted, condemned; and accursed for such, by that true sentence, and judgement of the fift generall Councell, which was consonant both to Scriptures, Fathers, and the foure former generall Councells, and approved by all succeeding generall Councells, Popes, and Bishops, that is, by the judgement of the whole Catholike Church, for more then fiftene hundred yeares together. A cause not onely most just, but commanded by the holy Apostle<sup>1</sup>, *Shun him that is an hereticke, after once or twice admonition*; much more after publike conviction and condemnation, by the upright judgement of the whole Catholike Church. On the other side, *Vigilius* and his Faction separated themselves from the Councell, and all that tooke part with it, for this onely reason, because they were Catholikes; because they embraced and constantly defended the Catholike faith; because he wold not cooperate (as *Stapleton* speaketh) with them, to maintaine the true Catholike faith, and so on their part, there was that which essentially made them Schismatickes. *Baronius* in saying that those who then dissented from *Vigilius*, were Schismatickes, speaks fitably to all his former assertions; For in saying this, he in effect saith, that Catholikes to avoid a Schisme, should have turned Heretickes, should have embraced Nestorianisme, and so have renounced and condemned the whole Catholike faith, as *Vigilius* then did. Had they so done, they should have been no Schismatickes with *Baronius*: But now for not condemning the Catholike faith with *Vigilius*, they must all be condemned by the Cardinall, for Schismatickes.

38. For the very same reason, the whole present Roman Church are Schismatickes at this day; and not the Reformed Churches from whom they separate themselves. For the cause of separation on their part, is the same for which *Vigilius* and his schismaticall faction separated themselves from the fift Councell, and the Catholikes of those times who all tooke part with it, even because wee refuse to embrace the Popes *Cathedrall* sentence in causes of faith, as the fift Councell refused that of *Vigilius*. The cause on our part is the same which the fift Councell then had, for that they defend the Popes hereticall constitution: nay not onely that of *Vigilius* (which yet were cause enough) but many other like unto that, and especially that one of *Leo* the tenth with his Laterane Councell, whereby *Supremacie* and with it *Infalibilitie* of judgement is given unto the Pope in all his decrees of faith: In which one *Cathedrall* decree (condemned for hereticall by the fift Councell, and constant judgement both of precedent and subsequent Councells, as before we have declared) not onely innumerable heresies such as none yet doth dreame of, are included, but by the venom and poyson of that one fundamētall heresie, not only all the other doctrines are corrupted, but the very foundation of faith is utterly overthrowne



throwne. Let them boast of multitudes, and universalitie never so much, (which at this day, is but a vaine brag) say they were far more, even foure hundred to one *Luther*, or the whole kingdome of *Babylon* to the two witnesses of God; yet seeing it is the cause which makes a schismaticke, & the cause of separation on their part is most unjust, but on ours most warrantable & holy, for that they will not cooperate with us, in upholding the ancient and Catholike faith, that especially of the fift Councell, condemning and accursing the Cathedrall sentence of Pope *Vigilius*, as hereticall, & all that defend it, as Heretickes, it evidently followeth, that they are the only, & essentially schismatickes, at this time, and in this great rent of the Church,

39. Whence againe doth ensue another Conclusion of no small importance. For it is a ruled case among them, such as *Bellarmino* avoucheth to be proved both by Scriptures, by Fathers, by pontificall decrees, and sound reason, that no schismatickes are in the Church, or of the Church, Now because out of the Church there is no salvation, it nearly concernes them, to be thinke themselves seriously what hope there is or can be unto them, who being, (as wee have proved) schismatickes, are for this cause by their owne doctrine, utterly excluded from the Church. But I will proceed no further in this matter, wherein I have stayed much longer then I intended, yet my hope is, that I have now abundantly cleared against *Baronius*, not onely, That one may dissent in faith, and bee disioyned in communion from the Pope, & yet neither be Heretickes nor Schismatickes: but, That none can now consent in faith, and hold communion with the Pope, but for that very cause he is by the judgement of the Catholike Church, both an hereticke and a schismaticke.

*in Lib. de Eccles. milit. ca. 5.*

*in Extra quam (de electione) nullus omnino salvatur. Conc. Lateran. ca. 1.*

# CHAP. XIII.

*The second Exception of Baronius; excusing Vigilus from heresie, for that he often professeth to hold the Councell of Chalcedon, and the faith thereof, refuted.*



Is second excuse for *Vigilius* is taken from that profession which both other defenders of the three Chapters, and *Vigilius* himselfe often maketh in his Constitution, that hee holdes the faith of the Councell of Chalcedon, and did all for the safety of that

Councell. Both parties saith *Baronius*, as well the defenders as the condemners of those three Chapters did testifie, that they desired nothing more, quam consultum esse catholica fidei, probat a S. Concilio Chalcedonensi, then to provide that the Catholike faith decreed at Chalcedon might be safe. Againe *liquet omnes*, it is manifest that

*a. An. 547. nu. 431*

*b. An. 546. nu. 331*

all Catholikes (in defence of the three Chapters) at once contradicted this noveltie, (set downe in the Emperors Edict for condemning those chapters) vindiceſque ſe Concilij Chalcedonenſis exhibuiſſe, and ſhewed themſelves to bee defenders of the Councell of Chalcedon. Of Vigilius in particular, hee not ſo little as ſortie times ingeminates this: *Vigilius* <sup>c</sup> writ theſe things, *pro defenſione & integritate Synodi Chalcedonenſis*, for the defence and ſafety of the Councell at Chalcedon. Vigilius <sup>d</sup> writ his conſtitution for no other cauſe (as by it iſevident) but to the end that all things which were defined by the Councell at Chalcedon, *firma conſiſterent*, might remaine firme and by no meanes be infringed. Again <sup>e</sup>, All that Vigilius or the reſt did in this cauſe, did tend hereunto, *ut conſultum eſſet dignitati & authoritati Synodi Chalcedonenſis*, that the dignity and authoritie of the Councell at Chalcedon might be kept ſafe and ſound. Thus Baroni<sup>us</sup>.

The writings of thoſe who defended thoſe Chapters declare the ſame. Victor in plaine termes affirmeth <sup>f</sup>, the three Chapters to have been approved and judged orthodox all by the Councell of Chalcedon, and the condemning of them, to bee the condemning of that Councell; and that for this cauſe, he reſuſed to condemne them, leaſt in ſo doing he ſhould condemne the Councell of Chalcedon. The like hee witneſſeth <sup>g</sup> of Facundus: whoſe owne words ſet downe by Baroni<sup>us</sup> <sup>h</sup> ſhew, that hee diſliked the condemners of thoſe three Chapters, becauſe by condemning them, *Synodum improbarent*, they condemned the Councell of Chalcedon. But none ſhewes the like love to that Councell, and care for it as doth Pope Vigilius in his Conſtitution; we decree ſaith he <sup>i</sup>, That the judgement of the Fathers at Chalcedon, ſhall be kept inviolable in all things, and particularly in this, touching the Epistle of Ibas: wee dare not call into queſtion their judgement: their judgement in omnibus conſervantes, we keepe in all things. Again <sup>k</sup>, we permit no man to innovate eiſher by addition, or detraction, or alteration, any thing which is ordained & ſet down by the Councell at Chalcedon. Again <sup>l</sup>, Behold, O Emper<sup>or</sup>, it is more cleare then the light, that we have alwayes beene deſirous to reverence the ſourne Councells, and that all things might remaine inviolable which by them are defined and judged. This, and much more to the like purpoſe ſaith Vigilius: Who now reading theſe things in his Conſtitution, and ſeeing him ſo fervent and zealous for the Councell at Chalcedon, and the faith therein declared, would not thinke, nay proclame Vigilius to be a moſt ſound Catholike, an utter enemy to Neſtorianiſme, as that holy Councell at Chalcedon was? Or who would not applaud Baroni<sup>us</sup> for his deviſe to defend and excuſe Vigilius from hereſie, becauſe he was ſo earneſt for the Councell of Chalcedon and the faith declared therein, which none can embrace, and be guiltie of Neſtorianiſme? This is his plea for Vigilius.

For answer whereunto, I am aſhamed that Baroni<sup>us</sup>, a Cardinal, and man of rare knowledge, as hee is ſuppoſed, ſhould ſhew

c An. 553. nu. 197.

d Ibid. nu. 47.

e Ibid. nu. 231.

f In Chron. an. 2. poſt Coſſ. Baſil.

g An. 10. poſt Coſſ. Baſil.

h An. 545. nu. 28.

i Apud Bar. an. 553. nu. 196.

k Ibid. nu. 197.

l Ibid. nu. 107.

shew himselfe so inconsiderate in this cause, as to seeke to excuse or defend *Vigilius*, by alledging the name, credit, or authoritie of the Councell of *Chalcedon*. For even that alone, if there were nothing else, puts upon him that just *Anathema* denounced by the fifth Councell, who thus decree, *Wee m anathematize the defenders of these Three Chapters, and those who have written, or doe write for them, or who doe defend, or endeavour to defend the simplicity of them, nomine sanctarum Patrum, aut sancti Chalcedonensis Concilij, by the name of the holy fathers, or of the Councell at Chalcedon.* The more then that either *Vigilius* pretends that Councell for defence of the *Three Chapters*, or, that *Baronius* pretends it for the defence of *Vigilius*, the more they are still involved in the Councells *Anathema*: and no marvell, for by alledging that Councell as a patrone of those *Three Chapters*; they slander that most holy Councell, and all that approve it, that is, the whole Catholike Church to be hereticall; and patrons of the most blasphemous, and condemned heresie of *Nestorius*.

m Coll. 8. pa. 386. b.  
O 588. a.

4. Let this passe: Is this reason, thinke you, of *Baronius* of any force to excuse *Vigilius*; hee professeth to defend the Councell of *Chalcedon*, therefore he is not an heretike? Truly of none at all, for who knoweth not that heretikes are as forward in challenging to themselves the names and authority of ancient Councils, and in professing to defend the same faith and doctrine which they taught. Take a view but of three or foure examples; and then you will pity *Baronius* for this so weake and silly excuse for *Vigilius*.

5. In the *Ephesine Laceration* there came certaine *Eutychean* heretikes, to the number of 35. who being justly excommunicated by that holy Bishop *Flavianus*, desired to bee restored to the communion of the Church: *Dioscorus* & his Synod willed them to make a profession of their faith; they did so; & their confессиō was this, *Sic sapimus, sicut 318. Patres in Nicæa sanxerunt, & sicut hic congregata sancta Synodus confirmarunt; wee beleeve as the Nicene Fathers decreed, and the (former) holy Synod at Ephesus confirmed, nor did we ever beleeve, or thinke otherwise than those holy Councils decreed: wee beleeve as S. Athanasius, S. Cyrill, S. Gregory, & omnes Catholici Episcopi, and as all Catholike Bishops have beleeved, and we answere all that beleeve otherwise.* Thus professed those *Eutychean* heretikes, and upon this profession they were by *Dioscorus* and his Synod restored to the communion of the Church; yea, which is more, that same *Laceration* or hereticall Synod at *Ephesus*, professing the former Councils to be, *tutelam nostræ Catholicæ fidei, the stay and prop of their Catholike faith*, (so they call their heresie) commanded the Nicene Creed, which was confirmed in the holy *Ephesine* Councell, to bee read before them; and the testimonies of many holy Fathers consenting therunto, *Peter, Athanasius, Felix, Iulius, Cyprian*, and others, together with the decrees of the *Ephesine* Councell, *Nulli hæc præferre, vel conscribere,*

n A. C. Concil. E. p. b.  
recitat. in Conc.  
Chal. A. B. 1. pa. 45.

o ibid. pa. 46.

p Ibid. pa. 47.

q Ibid. pa. 50.



1bid. pa. 57.

1 Conciliab. Ephes.  
in Añ. Conc.  
Chal. Añ. 1. pa. 11.

2 Añ. 6. pa. 561.

1 Confiteor ex du-  
bus naturis fuisse  
Dominum ante  
adunationem, post  
vero adunationem  
unam naturam con-  
fiteor: Dixit Euty-  
ches: sancta Syno-  
dus dixit, consenti-  
mus. Añ. Conc.  
Ephes. in Añ. Conc.  
Chal. Añ. 1. pa.  
28. b.

scribere, vel componere aliam fidem præter eam; that it should not be lawfull for any to utter, write, or compose any other faith, or Creed, but that which was decreed at Nice. After all these read before them, Dioscorus said, Existimo omnibus placere, I thinke that this faith decreed at Nice, and confirmed at Ephesus, is approved by us all, for we may not either retract, or make doubts of what they have done: and let every man say his judgement hereof: Then said Thalassius, I thinke the same, & qui contraria eis sapiunt, abominor: and I abhorre all who thinke the contrary. Iohn of Sebastia, I detest all heresies, & colo hanc solam fidem, and embrace this faith onely which was decreed at Nice. Stephanus, If any beleve otherwise than the Nicene Fathers decreed, let him be accursed, because this is the true and Catholike faith. and the whole Councell said, Omnes sumus ejusdem fidei, we are all of the same faith, which the Nicene Fathers decreed. Thus professed that whole Ephesine Latrocinie consisting of 128 Bishops, they all said, they held the Nicene faith, and none but that, accursing all that received not that: while yet at that very time when they thus professed, they were most damnable heretikes, and conspired together to abolish for ever the holy Nicene faith: They being Eutycheans, learned to make such a dissembling profession of Eutyches himselfe, who delivered up to that Synod a confession of his faith, bemoaning, that he was persecuted, because he would not deny the Nicene faith, nor beleve otherwise then those holy fathers had decreed, and the Ephesine Councell had confirmed; and who having repeated verbatim the Nicene Creed, addeth this, Thus was I taught by my progenitors, thus have I beleved, in this faith was I borne, in this faith was I baptized, and signed, (with the Crosse) in this faith was I consecrated, in this faith have I lived to this day, and in this faith doe I desire to dye: And this confession doe I make, attestante mihi tam Deo, quam vestra sanctitate, both God and this holy Councell being my witnesse hereof. Thus Eutyches, of whom (notwithstanding this so holy a profession) and all his partakers, their second Nicene Council truly saith, Eutyches, Dioscorus, and the heretikes of that branne approved the Nicene faith, confirmed in the holy Councell at Ephesus, sed tamen hæretici permanserunt, yet for all that they remained heretikes.

6. What can the Cardinall, or any of his friends oppose to this Example? If Vigilius be no heretike, because hee professeth to hold the faith of the Councell at Chalcedon, then neither Dioscorus, nor the Eutycheans, nor Eutyches himselfe, is an heretike, because they all with as great earnestnesse professed to keepe inviolable the Councils at Nice, and Ephesus, & the Catholike faith explained in them, accursing all who beleve the contrary thereunto: If notwithstanding this so resolute and earnest profession, Dioscorus & the Eutycheans, with that Ephesine conspiracy, were heretikes, & Eutyches himselfe an archheretike, as they al undoubtedly were; for even while they thus professed, they all denied two natures to remaine in Christ, after the union, as the very acts of that

that *Latrocinie* doe expressly declare, then was it a very silly reason of *Baronius*, to conclude, that *Vigilius* was no heretike, because in his decrees, for defence of the *Three Chapters*, hee is so resolute to keepe inviolable the Council of *Chalcedon*, and the faith there decreed.

7. The like may be seene in the *Monothelites*, of whom their second *Nicen Synod* saith thus. *Sergius Bishop of Constantinople, Cyrus Bishop of Alexandria, Honorius Bishop of Rome, and all who are called Monothelites, embraced both the Councils of Chalcedon, and the next which followed it (which is this fifth) and the generall Councils which went before these, to wit, the Nicen, Constantinopolitan, and Ephesine: verumtamen ut heretici a Catholica ecclesia dammati sunt, yet for all this they were condemned for heretickes, by the whole Church.* Why may not the Catholike Church give the like doome of *Vigilius* for defending the *three Chapters*, though hee professe and embrace all the same Councils, and particularly that of *Chalcedon*, as they did?

x *Ad. 6. p. 561.*

8. Perhaps other Heretickes would dissemble in their profession, but the *Nestoriani* (of which ranke *Vigilius* was) they were men of a better fashion, they would never professe to hold the decrees and faith of an holy Council, unless they did so indeed. Fie, of all heretickes they were most vile in this kinde: Read the acts of their Conventicle held in an Inn at *Ephesus*, during the time of the holy *Ephesine* Council, and you shall see, that as by lies, slanders and all base revilings they sought to disgrace *Cyrill*, and all other orthodoxall Bishops, calumniating them as heretickes, and oppugners of the *Nicen* faith, so they boasted of themselves, that they forsooth were the only men who defended and upheld the Council of *Nice* and the faith there explained. Witnesse besides their second *Nicen Synod*, their owne words, and writings; *Nestorius* himselfe and others of his sect, writ thus to the Emperour, we obeye your imperiall command, came to *Ephesus*, and our intention and desire was, to conforme with one consent the faith of the *Nicen* Fathers. In those instructions, which they gave to their Legates, they subscribed in this manner, I *Alexander Bishop of Hierapolis* *Nicen* faith subscripsi, have subscribed to the *Nicen* Faith, and of you shall doe any thing according to the faith expounded at *Nice*, to that I assent. In the like sort subscribed they all. To the Emperour that Conventicle thus writ, we do earnestly desire your pleasure, that you would command, that all men should subscribe to the faith expounded at *Nice*, and that they may reach nothing gooder to us, than that which is contrary to this faith. In another Epistle to the Emperour, we came, say they, to *Ephesus* with this desire, and intention, to subscribe the *Nicen* faith, and to subscribe to the profession of faith only, which was decreed at *Nice*. In their Epistle having repeated the *Nicen* Creed, they add

x *Ibid.*

y To 3. *Ad. Conc. Eph. ca. 20*

z *Ibid. ca. 19.*

a *Ibid. ca. 11.*

b *Append. ad tom.*

3. *Ad. Conc. Eph. ca. 3.*

c To 3. *Conc. Eph. ca. 12.*

In

d Ibid. ca. 13.

e Ibid. ca. 21.

f Ibid. ca. 6.

In hanc fidei expositionem nos omnes acquiescimus, wee all doe rest our selves in this declaration of faith made at Nice, we constantly perse-  
 ver in it. In their<sup>d</sup> Epistle to Rufus, we resist them, nihil aliud  
 spectantes, quam ut fidei Symbolum à patribus Nicenis editum, suum  
 locum perfectè obtineat, intending or aiming at nothing else, but that  
 the faith of the Nicene Creed, may fully and perfectly obtaine his due  
 place and honour. In their very Synodall sentence against Cyrill,  
 and other orthodoxall Bishops, they expresse<sup>e</sup> this, That they  
 shall remaine excommunicate, untill they doe integrè suscipere, intirely  
 embrace the Nicene faith, adding nothing unto it; which they repeat  
 againe in their Epistle to the Senate of Constantinople, saying:  
 If<sup>f</sup> Cyrill and the rest, will repent, & forsake their hereticall doctrines,  
 and embrace the faith of the Nicene Fathers, they shall straight  
 be absolved; and twentie times the like. Who reading no more  
 but these so manie, so earnest professions of Nestorius and the Ne-  
 storians, to defend in every point the Nicene faith, without ad-  
 dition or alteration, would not almost sweare that these doubt-  
 lesse were the onely men that stood firme and constant for the  
 Nicene Council, and that Cyrill and they who tooke part with  
 him (which was the whole Catholike Church) were the maine  
 oppugners of that Council, and the faith there decreed? And  
 yet notwithstanding all these professions, these were blasphe-  
 mous heretickes at that time, and most eagerly oppugned and  
 sought to abolish that very Nicene faith, which in words they  
 so professed and boasted of.

9. Vigilius and the defenders of the Three Chapters, as they  
 followed the Nestorians in their heresie, so did they in seeking  
 to countenance and grace their heresie, by professing to defend  
 the Council of Chalcedon, and the faith there decreed, yea to  
 defend it so constantly as that it might not in any part or sylli-  
 ble bee violated, pretending their opposites, who condemned  
 those Chapters, to oppugne and condemne the Council of  
 Chalcedon, as the old Nestorians slandered Cyrill, and other Ca-  
 tholikes of those times, to condemne the Council of Nice. And  
 yet notwithstanding all these professions, Vigilius and his adhe-  
 rents were as deepe in Nestorianisme as Nestorius himselfe,  
 and even while he pretends to maintaine, he doth quite over-  
 throw the holy Council of Chalcedon, and the faith therein  
 explained.

10. But neither the old, nor later Nestorians are in this kind  
 comparable to the modern Romanists, the last and worst sect of  
 heretikes that ever the Church was pestered withall. Their pro-  
 fession is not so minute, as to boast of this or that one Council,  
 or of some few fathers. All Scriptures make for them, All the  
 Fathers are theirs, All generall Councils confirme what they  
 teach. Their bookes doe swell with this ventositie. I pray you  
 heare the words but of one of them, but such an one, as puts  
 downe all Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, and all heretickes  
 that

papists brags



that went before him, *We*, saith he, *have* All authorities, Times, and places for our defence: Our enemies have none at all. Our doctrine is taught by all godly and famous professors of Divinity; All Popes, Fathers and Doctors that ever were in the Church; All Councils, particular and generall, All Universities, Schooles, Colledges and places of learning; since the time of Christ to Martin Luther: It is ratified by all authority, all Scriptures, Traditions, Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, Sibylls, Rabbins: All holy and learned Fathers, Historians, Antiquaries, and Monuments: All Synods, Councils, Lawes, Parliaments, Canons and Decrees of Popes, of Emperours, of Kings, and Rulers: All Martyrs, Confessors, and holy witnesses, by all friends and enemies, even Mahumetanes, Iemes, Pagans, Infidells; All former Heretikes, and schismatikes, by all testimonies that can bee devised, not onely in this world, but of God, of Angels and glorious soules, of Devils and damned spirits in hell. (The fittest witnesses of all.) What, any more? yes, the best is yet behind. I have, saith he<sup>k</sup>, read and studied all the Scriptures, the old Testament in the Hebrew Text, the new in the Greeke; I have studied the ancient Glosses and Scholies, Latine and Greeke. I have perused the most ancient Historians, Eusebius, Ruffinus, Socrates, Sozomene, Palladius, Saint Jerome, Saint Bede, and others; I have often with diligence considered the Decrees of the Popes, both of all that were before the Niceene Council and after, (then no doubt but he diligently considered of this Apostolicall Constitution of Pope Vigilius.) I have bene an auditor both of Scholasticall and Controversall questions, where all doubts and difficulties that wit or learning can devise, and invent, are handled, and most exquisitely debated; I have seene and read all the generall Councils; from the first at Nice, to the last at Trent, (then doubt not but hee read this fifth Council:) as also all approved particular and Provinciall Councils which be extant and ordinarily used; I have carefully read over all the workes and writings which be to be had of Dionysius the Areopagite; Saint Ignatius; Saint Policarp, Saint Clement, Martialis, Saint Iustine, Origen, Saint Basil, Saint Athanasius, Saint Gregory Nazianzen, Saint Gregory Nissene, Saint Gregory the Great, Saint Irene, Saint Cyprian, Fulgentius, Pamphilus the Martyr, Palladius, Theodoret, Ruffinus, Socrates, Sozomene, Evagrius, Cassianus, Lactantius, Vincentius Lyrinensis; all the workes of all these have I read and examined, and conferred them with Saint Augustine, Saint Jerome, Saint Ambrose, Saint Leo, Papius, Theophilact, Tertullian, Eusebius, Prudentius, and others most excellent Divines. And I take God and the whole Court of heaven to witnesse (before whom I must render an account of this protestation) that the same faith and religion which I defend, is taught and confirmed by those Hebrew and Greeke Scriptures, those Historians, Popes, Decrees, Scholies, and Expositions, Councils, Schooles and Fathers, and the profession of Protestants condemned by the same. Thus he.

11. Did ever mortall man read or heare of such a braggadochio? For learning and languages Terome is but a baby to him; more industrious and adamantine then Origen, then Adamantius himselfe. A shop, a storehouse of all knowledge; his head a Library of all Fathers, Councils, Decrees, of all writings, an Heluo, nay a very hell of books, he devoures up all. Rabsecha, Thraso, Pyrgopolinices, Therapontigonus; all ye Magnificoes & Gloriofoes, come sit at his feet, and learne of him

g An Apolog-  
icall Epistle pub-  
lished an. 1601.  
p. a. 118.  
h Ibid. p. a. 13.

i Ibid. p. a. 38.

k Ibid. p. a. 119.

the exact forme of vaunting and reviling. What silly men were *En- ziches*, *Nestorius*, and the old heretikes? they boasted but of one or two Councells. All Councells, all Fathers, all Decrees, all bookes, writings, and records, are witnesses of his faith. They sayd it, he sweart it before God and the whole Court of Heaven, that all Scriptures, Councels, Fathers, all witnesses in heaven, earth and hell, yea the Devil and all, are his, and confirme their Romane faith, and condemne the doctrine of Protestants. Alas what shall we doe, but even hide our selves in caves of the earth, and clefts of the rocks, from the force and fury of this *Goliath*, who thus braves it out in the open field, as who with the onely breath of his mouth can blow away whole legions, *quasi ventus folia, aut pannicula teloria*.

12. But let no mans heart faint because of this proud anonyvall Philistin. Thy servant, O Lord, though the meanest in the host of *Israel*, will fight with him; nor will I desire any other weapons, but this one pible stone of the judicial sentence of the fift generall Councell against *Vigilius*. This being taken out of *David*s bagge, that is, derived from Scriptures, consonant to all former, and confirmed by all succeeding Catholike Councells and Fathers, directly and unavoydably hits him in the forehead, it gives a mortall and incurable wound unto him, for it demonstrates not onely the foundation of their faith to be hereticall, and for such to bee condemned and accursed by the judgement of the whole Catholike Church, but all their doctrines, whatsoever they teach, because they all relye on this foundation of the Popes infallibility, are not onely unsound, and in the root hereticall, but even Antichristian also, such as utterly overthrow the whole Catholike faith. This, being one part of the Philistines weapons, wherein he trusted and vanted, with his owne sword is his head, (the head and foundation of all their faith) cut off, so that of him and the whole body of their Church it may be truly said, *Tacet ingens litore truncus, avulsamq; humeris caput, & sine nomine corpus*.

13. You see now how both ancient and moderne heretikes boast of Councells, and therefore, that the reason of *Baronius* is most inconsequent, that *Vigilius* was no heretike because hee professeth to hold the Councell of *Chalcedon*. Nay I say more, though one professeth to hold the whole Scripture, yet if with pertinacy hee hold any one doctrine repugnant thereunto, the profession of the Scriptures themselves cannot excuse such a man from being an heretike; If it could, then nor any of the old heretikes would want this pretence: or, to omit them, seeing both Protestants and Papists make profession to beleeve the Scriptures, and whatsoever is taught therein, would this profession exempt one from heresie, neither they, nor wee, should be, or be called heretikes. But seeing in truth they are, and wee in their Antichristian language are called heretikes, as *Cyrill*, and the orthodoxall beleevers in his time, were by the Nestorians, it is without question that this profession to hold the whole Scriptures, much lesse to hold one or two Councells (as *Vigilius* did) cannot free one from being an heretike.

14. You will perhaps say, can one then beleeve the whole Scripture;

Foundation of  
papists faith  
heretickall

ture, and be an heretike, or beleewe the faith decreed at *Nice*, *Ephesus*, or *Chalcedon*, and be an *Arian*, *Eutychian* or *Nestorian* heretike? No verily, for as the Scripture containeth a contradiction to every heresie, seeing as Saint *Austen* truly saith<sup>1</sup>, *all doctrines concerning faith, are set downe, and that also perspicuously therein*: so doe every one of those three Councils containe a contradiction to every one of those three heresies, and to all other which concerne the divinity or humanity of Christ. But it is one thing to professe the scriptures, or those three Councils, and say that he beleeveth them, which many heretikes may doe; and another thing to beleewe them indeed, which none can doe and be an heretike, for whosoever truly beleeveth the scriptures, cannot possibly with pertinacy hold any doctrine repugnant to scriptures; but such a man upon evident declaration that this is taught in them (though before he held the contrary) presently submits his wit and will to the truth which out of them is manifested unto him. If this he do not, he manifestly declareth, that he holds his error with pertinacy, and with an obstinate resolution not to yeeld to the truth of the scriptures, and so hee is certainly an heretike, notwithstanding his profession of the scriptures, which he falsly said he beleeveth, and held, when in very truth he held, and that pertinaciously the quite contrary unto them. The very like must be said of those three Councils, and them who either truly beleewe, or falsly say, that they beleewe the faith explained in them, or any one of them.

1 Lib. 2. de doctr.  
Christ. ca. 9.

15. Whence two things are evidently consequent, the former; that all heretikes are lyars in their profession; not onely because they professe that doctrine which is untrue, and hereticall, but because in words they professe to beleewe and hold that doctrine which they doe not, but hold, and that for a point of their faith, the quite contrary: All of them will and doe professe that they beleewe the scriptures, and the doctrines therein contained: and yet every one of them lye herein, for they beleewe one, if not moe doctrines contrary to the scriptures. The *Nestorians* professed to hold the *Nicene* faith, and so they professed two natures and but one person to bee in Christ, for that in the *Nicene* faith is certainly decreed: but they lyed in making this profession, for they beleeveth not one person, but pertinaciously held two persons to be in Christ. The *Eutychians* in professing the *Ephesine* Councell, professed in effect two natures to abide in Christ after the union, for this was certainly the faith of that holy Councell, but they lyed in this profession, for they held that after the union two natures did not abide in Christ, but one onely. The Church of *Rome* and members thereof professe to hold the faith of the fift generall Councell, and so professe *implicitè* the Popes *Cathedral* sentence in a cause of faith to be *fallible* and hereticall: but they lye in making this profession, for they beleewe not the Popes sentence in such causes to be *fallible*, but with the *Laierane* and *Trent* Councils, they hold it to be *infallible*. It is the practice of all heretikes to make such faire, though lying professions. For should they say in plaine termes, (that which is truth indeed) wee beleewe not the scriptures, nor the Councils of *Nice*, *Ephesus*, or *Chalcedon*, every man would spit at them, and



detest them, *cane pejus & angue*, nor could they ever deceive any, or gaine one proselyte. But when they commend their faith (that is, their heresie) to be the same doctrine with the scriptures, which the Councells of *Nice*, *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon* taught, by these faire pretences, and this lying profession, they insinuate themselves into the hearts of the simple, deceiving hereby both themselves and others.

16. The other consequent is this, That the profession of all heretikes is contradictory to it selfe. For they professe to hold the scriptures, and so to condemne every heresie, and yet withall they professe one private doctrine repugnant to scripture, and which is an heresie. The like may be said of the Councells. The *Nestorians* by professing to hold the faith decreed at *Nice*, professe Christ to bee but one person, and yet withall by holding *Nestorianisme*, they professe Christ to be two persons. The *Eutychians* by professing to hold the Councell of *Ephesus*, professe two natures to remaine in Christ after the union, which in that Councell is certainly decreed, and yet by professing the heresie of *Eutyches*, they professe the quite contradictory, that one nature onely remaines after the union. The Church of *Rome* and members thereof, by professing the faith of the sixth Councell, professe the Popes *Cathedral* sentence in a cause of faith to be *fallible*, and *de facto* to have beene *hereticall*, and yet they professe the direct contradictory, as the Councell of *Laterane* hath defined, that the Popes sentence in such causes is *infallible*, and neither hath beene nor can be *hereticall*. So repugnant to it selfe, and incoherent is the profession of all heretikes, that it fighteth both with the truth, and with it owne selfe also. The very same is to be seene in *Vigilius* and his *Constitution*. For in professing to defend the *three Chapters*, and in decreeing that all shall defend them, he professeth all the blasphemies of *Nestorius*, and decreeth that all shall maintaine them, and professing to hold the faith decreed at *Chalcedon*, and decreeing that all shall hold it, he professeth that *Nestorianisme* is heresie, and decreeth that all shall condemne it for heresie: and so decreeing both these, he decreeth that all men in the world shall beleeeve two contradictories, and beleeeve them as Catholike Truths. Such a worthy *Apostolicall* decree is this of *Vigilius*, for defending whereof *Baronius* doth more then toyle himselfe.

17. You will againe demand: Seeing *Vigilius* doth so earnestly and plainly professe both these, why shall not his expresse profession to hold the Councell of *Chalcedon*, make him or shew him to bee a Catholike, rather then his other expresse profession, to defend the *Three Chapters*, make or shew him to bee an hereticke? Why rather shall his *hereticall*, then his *orthodoxall* profession give denomination unto him? I also demand of you, Seeing every hereticke in expresse words professeth to beleeeve the whole Scripture, which is in effect a condemning of every heresie, why shall not this *orthodoxall* profession make or shew him to be a Catholike, rather then his expresse profession of some one doctrine contrarie to Scripture (say for example *ake*, of *Arianisme*) make or shew him to bee an *Arian* hereticke? The reason

reason of both is one and the same. Did an *Arian* so professe to hold the Scriptures, that hee were resolved to forsake his *Arianisme*, and confesse Christ to bee *human* upon manifestation that the Scriptures taught this, certainly his professiō of *Arianisme*, with such a professiō to hold the Scriptures, could not make him an hereticke, no more then *Cyprians* profession of Rebaptization, or *Irenees* of the millenarie heresie, did make them heretikes: Erre hee should, as they did, but being not pertinacious in error, hereticke hee could not be, as they were nor. But it falls out otherwise with all heretickes. They professe to hold the Scripture, yet so that they resolve not to forsake that private doctrine which they have chosen to maintaine: That they will hold, and they will have that to be the doctrine of the Scripture, notwithstanding all manifestation to the contrarie, even of the Scriptures themselves. They resolve of this, that whosoever, Bishops, Councils, or Church, teach the contrarie to that, or say & judge that the Scripture so teacheth, they all erre or mistake the meaning of the Scriptures. Thus did not *Cyprian*, nor *Irenee*. And this wilfull and pertinacious resolution it is, which evidently sheweth that in truth they beleeve not the Scriptures, but beleeve their own fancies, though they say a thousand times, that they beleeve and embrace whatsoever the Scriptures teach, for did they beleeve any doctrine, say *Arianisme*, *co nomine*, because the Scripture teacheth it, they would presently beleeve the contrarie thereunto, when it were manifested unto them (as it was to the *Arians*, by the *Nicen* Coucell) that the Scripture taught the contrarie to their error. Seeing this they will not doe, It is certaine that they hold their private opiniō, *co nomine* because they will hold it, and they hold it to bee the doctrine of scripture, not because it is so, but because they will have it to bee so, say what any will or can to the contrarie. So their owne will, and not Scripture, is the reason why they beleeve it, nay why they hold it with such a stiffe opinion, for beise it is not, it cannot be. This pertinacie to have beene in the *Nestorians*, *Eutycheans* and the rest, is evident. Had they beleeved, as they professed; the faith decreed at *Nice* and *Ephesus*; then upon manifestation of their errors out of those Councils, they would have renounced their heresies: but seeing the *Nestorians* persisted to hold two persons in Christ, notwithstanding, that the whole Council of *Ephesus* manifested unto them that the *Nicene* Council held but one person, and seeing the *Eutycheans* persisted to hold but one nature after the union, notwithstanding that the whole Council at *Chalcedon* manifested unto them, that the holy *Ephesine* Synod held two natures to abide in him after the union, they did hereby make it evident unto all, that they so professed to hold those Councils, as that they resolved not to forsake their *Nestorian* and *Eutichean* heresies for any manifestation of the truth, or conviction of their error out of those Councils, and their profession of them was in effect as if they had said, we hold those Councils, and will have them to teach what wee affirme, whatsoever any man or Council faith, or can say to the contrarie. The like must be said of Pope *Vigilius* in this cause: Had he so professed to hold the Council of *Chalcedon*, as that upon manifestation

that the *Three Chapters* were condemned by it, he would have forsaken the defence of them, then certainly his defending of these 3. *Chapters* had not bin pertinacious, nor should have made him an hereticke, but his profession to hold the faith decreed at *Chalcedon*, notwithstanding his error about the 3. *Chapters*, should have made him a catholike. But seeing *Vig.* persisted to defend the 3. *Chaps.* though it was made evident unto him by the Synodall judgement of the fift Councell, that the definition of faith decreed at *Chalcedon* condemned them all, he by this persisting in heresie did demonstrate to all, that he professed to hold the Councell at *Chalcedon*, no otherwise then with a pertinacious resolution not to forsake the defence of those *Three hereticall Chapters*, although the whole Church of God should manifest unto him, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* condemned the same: and for this cause his defending of those *three Chapters*, with this pertinacie and willfull resolution declareth him to bee indeed an hereticke, notwithstanding his profession to hold the Councell of *Chalcedon* and faith thereof, whereby all those *Chapters* are condemned, which profession being joyned with the former pertinacie, could not now either make or declare him to be a Catholike.

18. The very same must bee said of the present *Romane Church* and members thereof. Did they in such sort professe to hold the fift Councell, and faith thereof, as that upon manifestation that this Councell beleeveth, taught and decreed that the Popes *Cathedrall* sentence in a cause of faith is *fallible*, and *de facto* hath beene hereticall, they would condemne that their *fundamentall* heresie of the Popes *Cathedrall infallibilitie* decreed in their *Laterane* and *Trent* assemblies, then should they much rather, for their profession of the fift Councell and faith thereof, bee *orthodoxall*, then for professing (together with this) the Popes *Cathedrall infallibilitie*, bee hereticall. But seeing they know by the very Acts and judicial sentence of that fift Councell, by which the *Cathedrall Constitution* of *Vigilius* is condemned and accursed for hereticall in this cause of faith, touching the *Three Chapters*, that the fift Councell beleeveth this, and decreed, under the censure of an *Anathema*, that all others should beleve it, and that all who beleve the contrary, are heretikes: seeing, I say, notwithstanding this manifestation of the faith of that Councell, they persist to defend the Popes *Cathedrall infallibilitie* in those causes, yea, defend it as the very foundation of their faith, this makes it evident to all, that they do no otherwise professe to hold this fift Councell, or the other, whether precedent, or following, (for they all are consonant to this) but with this pertinacious resolution, not to forsake that their *fundamentall* heresie, and therefore their expresse profession of this fift, and other generall Councels, yea, of the Scriptures themselves, cannot be so effectually to make them Catholikes, as the profession of the Popes *infallibilitie*, which is joyned with this pertinacy, is to make and demonstrate them to be heretikes.

19. There is yet a further point to be observed touching the pertinacy of *Vigilius*: For one may be, and often is pertinacious in his error, not onely after, but even before conviction, or manifestation of the

3 popes infallibly  
hereticall.



the truth made unto him; and this happeneth whensoever hee is not *paratus corrigi*, prepared, or ready to be informed of the truth, and corrected thereby, or when he doth not, or will not, *tanta sollicitudine quærare veritatem*, with care and diligence seek to know the truth, as after S. *Anthon*, and out of him *Ockham*, *Gerson*, *Navar*, *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, and many others doe truly teach. See now, I pray you, how farre *Vigilius* was from this care of seeking, and preparation to embrace the truth. He by his *Apoſtolicall* authoritie decreed, that none should either write, or speake, or teach ought contrary to his *Conſtitutions*; or if they did, that his decree should stand for a condemnation and refutation of whatſoever they should either write or speake. Here was a trick of *Papall*, that is, of the most supreme pertinacy that can bee devised: He takes order before hand, that none shall ever, I say, not convict him, but, so much as manifest the truth unto him, or open his mouth, or write a syllable for the manifestation thereof: and so, being not prepared to bee corrected, nor not informed neither, hee was pertinacious, and is justly to bee so accounted before ever either Bishop, or Councell manifested the truth unto him. Even as he is farre more wilfully and obstinately delighted in darknesse, who dammes up all the windowes, chinkes, and passages, whereby any light might enter into the house, wherein hee is, than hee, who lyeth a sleepe, and is willing to be awaked, when the light shineth about him: So was it with Pope *Vigilius* at this time, his tying of all mens tongues, and hands, that they should not manifest by word, or writing, the truth unto him; his damming up of the light, that never any glimpse of the truth might shine unto him, argues a mind most damnablely pertinacious in error, and so far from being prepared and ready to embrace the truth, that it is obdurate against the same, and will not permit it so much as to come neere unto him.

20. The very like pertinacy is at this day in the *Romane* Church, and all the members thereof: for having once set downe this transcendent principle, the *foundation* of all which they beleeve, that the Popes judgement, in causes of faith, is *infallible*, they doe by this exclude and utterly shut out all manifestation of the truth, that can possibly bee made unto them: Oppose whatſoever you will against their error, Scriptures, Fathers, Councils, reason and sense it selfe, it is all refused before it be proposed, seeing the Pope, who is *infallible*, saith the contrary to that which you would prove, you, in disputing from those places, doe either mis-cite them, or mis-interpret the Scriptures, Fathers, and Councils, or your reason from them is sophistical, and your sense of sight, of touching, of tasting, is deceived; some one defect or other there is in your opposition, but an error in that which they hold, there is, nay, there can be none, because the Pope teacheth that, and the Pope, in his teaching is *infallible*. Here is a charme, which causeth one to heare with a deafe eare, whatſoever is opposed: the very head of *Medusa*, if you come against it, it stunneth you at the first, and turnes both your reason, your sense, and your selfe also, into a very stone. By holding this one *fundamentall* position, they are pertinacious in all their errors, and that in the highest degree of pertinacy, which

primary before  
combination.

m Epist. 163.

n Lib. 4. part. 1.

ca. 2.

o Conf. 12. de

peritencia. part.

1. pa. 430.

p Encb. ca. 111.

nu. 22.

q Lib. 1. de iusta

punit. heres. ca. 7

r Conf. Vigil.

apud Bar. an.

353. nu. 208.

A charme: a  
which is no perfect  
made

which the wit of man can devise; yea, and pertinacious before all conviction, and that also though the truth should never by any meanes be manifested unto them: For by setting this downe, they are so far from being prepared to embrace the truth, though it should be manifested unto them, that hereby they have made a *fundamentall* law for themselves, that they never will be convicted, nor ever have the truth manifested unto them. The onely meanes in likelihood to perswade them, that the doctrines which they maintaine, are heresies, were first to perswade the Pope, who hath decreed them to bee *orthodoxall*, to make a contrary decree, that they are *hereticall*. Now although this may be morally judged, to be a matter of impossibilitie; yet, if his Holinesse could be induced hereunto, and would so farre stoop to Gods truth, as to make such a decree; even this also could not perswade them, so long as they hold that *foundation*. They would say, either the Pope were not the true Pope, or that he defined it not as Pope, and *ex Cathedra*; or that, by consenting to such an hereticall decree, hee ceased *ipso facto* to be Pope, or the like; some one or other evasion they would have still; but, grant the Popes sentence to be *fallible*, or hereticall, whose *infallibility* they hold as a doctrine of faith, yea, as the *foundation* of their faith, they would not. Such, and so unconquerable pertinacy is annexed, and that essentially, to that one *Position*, that so long as one holds it, and whensoever he ceaseth to hold it, hee ceaseth to be a member of their Church,) there is no possible meanes in the world to convict him, or convert him to the truth.

21. You doe now clearly see, how feeble, and inconsequent that Collection is, which *Baronius* here useth in excuse of Pope *Vigilius*, for that he often professeth to defend the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and the faith therein explained: Hee did but herein that which is the usuall custome of all other heretikes, both ancient and moderne: Quit him for this cause, and quit them all; condemne them, and then, this pretence can no way excuse *Vigilius* from heresie. They all with him profess, with great ostentation to hold the doctrines of the Scriptures, of Fathers, of generall Councels, but because their profession is not onely lying, and contradictorie to it selfe, but alwayes such, as that they retaine a wilfull and pertinacious resolution, not to forsake that heresie which themselves embrace, as *Vigilius* had, not to forsake his defence of the *Three Chapters*: Hence it is that their verbal profession of Scriptures, Fathers, and Councels, cannot make any of them, nor *Vigilius* among them, to be esteemed *orthodoxall*, or Catholike: but the reall and cordiall profession of any one doctrine, which they, with such pertinacy hold against the Scriptures, or holy generall Councels, as *Vigilius* did this of the *Three Chapters*, doth truly demonstrate them all, and *Vigilius* among them, to be heretikes. And this may suffice for answer to the second exception, or evasion of *Baronius*.

if the pope would  
recount: then  
he is no pope:  
or is he?

## CAP. 15.

*The third exception of Baronius in excuse of Vigilius, taken from his confirming of the fift Councell, answered; and how Pope Vigilius, three or foure times changed his judgement in this cause of faith.*

**I**N the third place *Baronius* comes to excuse *Vigilius*, by his act of confirming and approving the fift Councell, and the decree thereof for condemning the *Three Chapters*. It appeareth, saith hee<sup>a</sup>, that *Vigilius*, to the end he might take away the schisme, and unite the Easterne Churches to the Catholike communion, *quintam Synodum auctoritate Apostolica comprobavit*, did approve the fift Synod by his Apostolicall authoritie. Againe<sup>b</sup>, when *Vigilius* saw, that the Easterne Church would be rent from the West, unlesse he consented to the fift Synod, *comprobavit*, he approved it: Again<sup>c</sup>, *Pelagius* thought it fit, as *Vigilius* had thought before, that the fift Synod, wherein the three Chapters were condemned, should bee approved: and again<sup>d</sup>, *Cognitum fuit*, it was publikely known, that *Vigilius* had approved the fift Synod, and condemned the three Chapters. The like is affirmed by *Bellarminus*<sup>e</sup>, *Vigilius* confirmed the fift Synod, per libellum, by a booke, or writing. *Binius* is so resolute herein, that hee saith f, *A Vigilio (quintam) Synodum confirmatam et approbatam esse nemo dubitat*; none doubteth but that *Vigilius* confirmed and approved the fift Councell. Now if *Vigilius* approved the fift Councell, and condemned the *Three Chapters*, it seemes that all which wee have said of his contradicting the fift Synod, and of his defending those *Three Chapters*, is of no force, and that by his assent to the Synod he is a good Catholike. This is the Exception, the validity whereof we are now to examine.

1. For the clearing of which whole matter, it must bee remembred, that all, which hitherto wee have spoken of *Vigilius*, hath reference to his Apostolicall decree, published in defence of those *Three Chapters*, that is, to *Vigilius*, being such as that decree doth shew, and demonstrate him to have beene, even a pertinacious oppugner of the faith, and a condemned heretike by the judicall sentence of the fift Councell: but now *Baronius* drawes us to a further examination of the cariage of *Vigilius* in this whole businesse, and how hee behaved himselfe from the first publishing of the Emperours Edict, which was in the twentieth year of *Iustinian*, unto the death of *Vigilius*, which was, as *Baronius* accounteth<sup>h</sup>, in the 29 of *Iustinian*, and second yeare after the fift Councell was ended; but, as *Victor*, (who then lived) accounteth<sup>i</sup>, in the 31 of *Iustinian*, and fourth yeare after the Synod: And, for the more cleare view of his cariage, wee must observe foure severall periods of time, wherein *Vigilius*, during those nine or tenne yeares, gave divers severall judgements, and made three or foure eminent changes in this cause of faith. The first, from the promulgation of the Emperours Edict, while he remained at *Rome*, and was absent from the Emperor. The second, after he came to *Constantinople*, and to the

a An. 554. nu. 7.

b An. 553. nu. 235.

c Ibid. nu. 236.

d An. 556. nu. 1.

e Lib. 1. de Cone. ca. 5. 5. Coacta. f Not. in Conc. 5. g Praefatio.

g Bar. an. 546. nu. 8.

h An. 555. nu. 1.

i In Chron. an. 17. post Conf. Basil.



the Emperours prefence, but before the fift Synod was begun. The third, in the time of the fift Synod, and about a yeare after the end and diffolution thereof. The fourth, from thence, that is, from the yeare after the Synod, unto his death.

k *Ipsa exordio af-  
ferre ab Impe-  
ratore senten-  
tia.* Bar. an. 546  
nu. 38. et 39.

l *Ile (Vigilius)  
prophana va-  
cum novitates  
sibi vendicavit  
arguendus.* Ait  
Facund. apud  
Bar. an. 546. nu.  
57.  
m *Nisi contrari-  
um Synodo  
Chalcedonensi  
iudicaret.* Ibid.  
nu. 58.  
n *An. 547. nu.*  
44. et 32.  
o *Ibid.*  
p *Facund. loco  
cit. nu. 56.*  
q *2 Cor. 12. v.*  
22.  
r *An. 546. nu.*  
47. et 547. nu.  
45.

l *An. 546. nu. 44*

r *Hec Facun-  
dus iubente Vi-  
gilio.* Bar. ibid.

u *Scriptum ad-  
versus Impera-  
torem edidit.*  
An. 546. nu. 39.  
x *Opus grande  
& elegans, et  
patrum autori-  
tatis muni-  
tum.* Poss. Bibl.  
in Facund.

3. At the first \* publishing of the Edict, many of the Westerne Churches, *impugnabant Edictum*, did oppose themselves to it, and, as *Baronius* saith, *insurrexere*, made an insurrection against it, and the Emperour: Pope *Vigilius*, as in place and dignity hee was more eminent, so in this Insurrection he was more forward, and a ring-leader unto them all: And because the conflict was likely to bee troublesome, *Vigilius* used all his authority and art in managing of this cause. First he proclameth the Edict, and condemning of the *Three Chapters* to bee a prophane <sup>1</sup> novelty, judging <sup>2</sup> it to bee contrary to the holy faith, and Councell at *Chalcedon*: To this he addes writings, threats, and punishments: *Literas scripsit adversus eos*, saith *Baronius*, *Vigilius* writ letters against all that held with the Emperour, and his Edict: in those letters, *comminatus* <sup>3</sup> est eis qui consenserunt; he threatened those that consented to the Emperour; *edixit* <sup>4</sup> & *indixit* correctionem; he decreed punishment unto them, and forewarned them thereof; telling them, that unlesse they did amend their fault, hee would draw out his *Apostolike* blade against them, protesting with the Apostle <sup>5</sup> q, *I feare when I come, I shall not finde you such as I would, and that I shall be found of you such as yee would not*. Nor were his threats in vaine, as it seemeth, seeing *Baronius* <sup>6</sup> tells us, that for this very cause, either he or *Stephanus* his Legate, in his name did excommunicate, besides others, two Patriarkes, *Mennas* of *Constantinople*, and *Zoilus* of *Alexandria*, and with them *Theodorus* Bishop of *Cesarea*.

4. Thus he dealt with inferiour persons, but for the Emperour he took another course with him: He saw what danger it was to write against Emperours, that he would not do himself: But whē, like *Pirrhus*, *ipse sibi cavito loco*, he had provided for his owne safety; then he thrusts forward *Facundus* Bishop of *Hermian* into that busines. *Facundus* an eloquent mā indeed, as his name also imports, but a most obstinate heretike & Schismatike, seeing he persisted in defence of the *three Chapters*, not only before, but after the judicial sentence of the general Councell; & yet is he comended by *Baronius* <sup>7</sup> to be *prudentissimus agonistes*, a most wise champion for the Church: but the more hereticall hee is, the more like, and better liked is hee to *Baronius*. Him doth *Vigilius* <sup>8</sup> egge, and even command to write against the Emperour; yea, *sugillare*, (it is the Cardinals word) to taunt and flout him, for his Edict; nor him onely; but in him to reprove, *omnes simul Principes*, all Princes who ever doe presume to meddle with a cause of faith, or make lawes therein, as *Iustinian* had done. *Facundus* being thus directed, encouraged, and warranted by Pope *Vigilius*, and being but his instrument in this matter, writes <sup>9</sup> a large volume containing twelve bookes, against the Emperour, in defence of the *three Chapters*. A worke stuffed with heresie, yet highly commended by *Possessine* <sup>10</sup> the Iesuite, as being a brave booke strengthened with the authorities of the Fathers. There he takes upon him to revile the Emperour in most uncivill and undu-

tisull

risull manner, as if, forsooth, *fides et omnium ex aius voluntate penderet*; the faith of all Churches did hang on the Emperours sleeve; and as if none might beleve otherwise, *quam praeceperet imperator*, then the Emperour commanded; telling him, that it were more meet for him, *se infra limitem suum continere*, to keepe himselfe within his owne bounds, as other Artificers kept their own shops; the Weaver not meddling with the Forge and Anvill; nor the Cobler with a Carpenters office. Such rude, homely, and undutifull comparisons doth the Popes Oratour use in this cause: And, as if *Facundus* had not paid the Emperour halfe enough, *Baronius* helps him with a whole Cart-load of such Romish eloquence; calling the Emperour, utterly<sup>a</sup> unlearned, *qui nec Alphabeta aliquando didicisset*, who never had learned so much as his A, B, C, nor could<sup>b</sup> ever read the Title of the Bible: a *Punicus*, a palliated Theologue, a sacrilegious<sup>c</sup> person, a wisseless<sup>d</sup>, furious, and frantike fellow, possessed with an evil spirit, and driven by the Devill himselfe: Such an one to presume against all right, to make lawes concerning matters of faith, concerning Priests and the punishments of them? adding<sup>e</sup>, that the whole Catholike faith would be in jeopardie, *si qui ejusmodi esset*; if such an *Infirmian* should make lawes of faith; yea, such lawes, *quas i dolo conscripserunt heretici*, as heretikes had craftily penned; telling<sup>f</sup> him, (as *Facundus* had before) that it were more fit for him to looke to the government of the Empire; and upbraiding him with that proverbiall admonition, *Ne ultra Crepidam*, S<sup>r</sup> Cobler go not beyond your Last & Latchet. This scurrility doth the Cardinall use against the most religious and prudent Emperour, and his holy and orthodoxall Edict; and hee<sup>g</sup> saith, that he was<sup>h</sup> willing to adde these, *ad roborandam Facundi sententiam*, so fortifie the sentence of *Facundus*, whereby he, with *Vigilius*, did defend the *Three Chapters*.

5. Were one disposed to make sport with the Cardinall, himselfe here offereth a large field; wherein one may exspaciate; and seeing he useth not others as Kings, hee might expect, *lege talionis*, not to be used himselfe as a Cardinall: But because wee shall in another place more fitly convince the Cardinall; both for his reviling the Emperour, and railing at his Edict, as penned by heretikes; for this time I will but by the way observe two or three points touching this passage. The first, that *Facundus* by defending the *Three Chapters*, and *Baronius* by fortifying his defence, doe unavoidably pull upon themselves the just censure of *Anathema*, denounced by the holy Councell against the defenders of those Chapters, and those who are abettors of them: So, the more *Baronius* doth labour to fortifie the sentence of *Facundus*, the more he entangles himselfe in that curse of the generall Council. The second; that both *Facundus* & *Baronius* do quite mistake the matter, in carping at the Emperour, as if by his Edict, or in condemning those *Three Chapters*, he had taught or published some new doctrine of faith; he did not: He taught and commanded all others to embrace that true, ancient, and Apostolicall faith, which was decreed and explained at *Chalcedon*, as both the whole fifth Councell witnesseth, which sheweth, that all those Chapters were *implicite*, but yet truly, and indeed condemned in the definition of faith made at *Chalcedon*;

y *Facund. lib. 1.2*  
ejus verba citantur a Bar. an.  
546. nu. 41.

a An. 546. nu. 42  
b An. 528. nu. 2.  
c An. 551. nu. 4.  
d An. 551. nu. 4.  
e An. 551. nu. 4.  
f An. 551. nu. 4.  
g An. 551. nu. 4.  
h An. 551. nu. 4.

i An. 551. nu. 4.  
k An. 551. nu. 4.  
l An. 551. nu. 4.  
m An. 551. nu. 4.  
n An. 551. nu. 4.  
o An. 551. nu. 4.  
p An. 551. nu. 4.  
q An. 551. nu. 4.

r An. 551. nu. 4.  
s An. 551. nu. 4.  
t An. 551. nu. 4.  
u An. 551. nu. 4.  
v An. 551. nu. 4.  
w An. 551. nu. 4.  
x An. 551. nu. 4.  
y An. 551. nu. 4.

z An. 551. nu. 4.  
aa An. 551. nu. 4.  
ab An. 551. nu. 4.  
ac An. 551. nu. 4.  
ad An. 551. nu. 4.  
ae An. 551. nu. 4.  
af An. 551. nu. 4.  
ag An. 551. nu. 4.

ah An. 551. nu. 4.  
ai An. 551. nu. 4.  
aj An. 551. nu. 4.  
ak An. 551. nu. 4.  
al An. 551. nu. 4.  
am An. 551. nu. 4.  
an An. 551. nu. 4.  
ao An. 551. nu. 4.

ap An. 551. nu. 4.  
aq An. 551. nu. 4.  
ar An. 551. nu. 4.  
as An. 551. nu. 4.  
at An. 551. nu. 4.  
au An. 551. nu. 4.  
av An. 551. nu. 4.  
aw An. 551. nu. 4.

ax An. 551. nu. 4.  
ay An. 551. nu. 4.  
az An. 551. nu. 4.  
ba An. 551. nu. 4.  
bb An. 551. nu. 4.  
bc An. 551. nu. 4.  
bd An. 551. nu. 4.  
be An. 551. nu. 4.

bf An. 551. nu. 4.  
bg An. 551. nu. 4.  
bh An. 551. nu. 4.  
bi An. 551. nu. 4.  
bj An. 551. nu. 4.  
bk An. 551. nu. 4.  
bl An. 551. nu. 4.  
bm An. 551. nu. 4.

bn An. 551. nu. 4.  
bo An. 551. nu. 4.  
bp An. 551. nu. 4.  
bq An. 551. nu. 4.  
br An. 551. nu. 4.  
bs An. 551. nu. 4.  
bt An. 551. nu. 4.  
bu An. 551. nu. 4.

bv An. 551. nu. 4.  
bw An. 551. nu. 4.  
bx An. 551. nu. 4.  
by An. 551. nu. 4.  
bz An. 551. nu. 4.  
ca An. 551. nu. 4.  
cb An. 551. nu. 4.  
cc An. 551. nu. 4.

cd An. 551. nu. 4.  
ce An. 551. nu. 4.  
cf An. 551. nu. 4.  
cg An. 551. nu. 4.  
ch An. 551. nu. 4.  
ci An. 551. nu. 4.  
cj An. 551. nu. 4.  
ck An. 551. nu. 4.

cedon; and Pope Gregorie also testifieth the same, saying of this first Councell, that it was *in omnibus sequax*, in every point a follower of the Councell at Chalcedon. This the religious Emperour wisely discerning, did by his imperiall edict, and authoritie (as Constantine, and Theodosius had done before him) ratifie that old and Catholike faith, which the Nestorians by defending those Chapters craftily undermined at that time. The third & speciall point which I observe, is that which Baronus noteth, as the cause why Pope Vigil. was so eager against the Emperour and his edict. And what thinke you was it? Forsooth because, *Iustinian primus* <sup>m</sup> *legem sancivit*, was the first who made a law, and published a Decree for condemning of those three Chapters. Had the Pope first done this; and Iustinian seconded his holinesse therein, hee had beene another Constantine, a second Theodosius, the dearest child of the Church. But for Princes to presume to teach the Pope, or make any lawes concerning the faith; before they consult with the Romanes, or make him acquainted therewith, that's <sup>m</sup> *piaculum*, a capitall, and irremissible sinne, the Pope may not endure it. So then, it was neither zeale, nor pietie, nor love, to the truth, but meere stomacke and pride in Vigilius to oppose himselfe to the Emperours edict, and make an insurrection against him. A sory reason God wot for any wise man in the world, much more for the Pope, to contradict the truth and oppugne the Catholike faith. Now if Iustinian for doing this which was an act of prudence and pietie, tending wholly to the good and peace of the Church, if hee could not escape so undutifull usage at the Pope, & his orators in those better times, religious Kings may not thinke it strange, to finde the like or far worse entertainement at the Popes of these dayes and their instruments, men so exact and eloquent in reviling, that in all such base and uncivill usage they goe as farre beyond Facundus, Tertullus, and them of former ages, as drossie or the most abject mettle is inferiour to refined gold. This is the first Period, and first judgement of Vigilius touching this cause of the three Chapters: in defence of which, and oppugning of the Emperours edict, hee continued more then a yeare after the publishing of the Edict, even all that time while hee remained at Rome; and was absent from the Emperour.

o *Edictum editum*  
fuit anno. 546.  
Bar. eo anno nu.  
2. Constantinopolim ingressus est  
an. 547. prope  
die Natalis Domini.  
Bar. an. illo.  
nu. 26.  
p Bar. an. eod.  
nu. 31. 32.  
q *Ibid.* nu. 37.

6. As soone almost as Vigilius was come to Constantinople, and had saluted the Emperour, and conferred with them who stood for the Edict, he was quite another man, he changed *tum calo animum*, the aire of the Emperours Court altered the Popes judgement, and this was about a yeare after the publishing of the Edict: Now that all things might be done with more solemnitie and advise, there was a Synod held shortly after his comming, at Constantinople, wherein Vigilius with thirty Bishops condemned the Three Chapters, and consented to the Emperours Edict. This Facundus expressly witnesseth, saying, *How shall not this bee a prejudice to the cause, if it bee demonstrated that Pope Vigilius with thirty Bishops or therabouts, have condemned the Epistle (of Ibas) approved by the Councell of Chalcedon, and anathematized that Bishop (Theodorus of Mopsvestia) with his doctrines, the praises whereof are set downe in that Councell?* Thus Facundus. Besides all this, Vigilius was

now



now so forward in this cause, that as before he had written bookes against the Edict, in defence of the *three Chapters*, and excommunicated those who condemned those Chapters; so now on the Emperors side, he writ bookes, and gave judgement, for the condemning of those Chapters, and excommunicated some, by name, *Rusticus* and *Sebastianus*, two Romane Deacons, because they would not condemn them. *Non* can deny saith *Baronius*, that *Vigilius* writ a booke against the three chapters, and sent it unto *Mennas* Bishop of Constantinople. Again, there is certaine prooffe, *lata ab eo sententia*, of the sentence (of excommunication) pronounced by *Vigilius*, against *Rusticus*, *Sebastianus*, and other defenders of those chapters: and this is so cleare, *ut nulla dubitatio esse possit*, that there can be no doubt at all, but that *Vigilius* approved by a Constitution the Emperors sentence, and condemned the three Chapters. So *Baronius*. The Epistles of *Vigilius* doe testifie the same. In that to *Rusticus* and *Sebastianus* he very often makes mention, *Judicati nostri*, *Constituti nostri*, of our judgement, of our constitution against the three chapters, concerning which he addeth, that it was ratified by his Apostolicall authority, saying, that no man may doe, *contra constitutum nostrum quod ex beati Petri autoritate proferimus*, against this our Constitution which we set forth by the authority of Saint Peter. The like hee testifieth, in his Epistle to *Valentinianus*, where he saith he, that those things may suffice the children of the Church, which he writ to *Mennas*, concerning the blasphemies of *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia* and his person, concerning the Epistle of *Ibas*, and the writings of *Theodorus* against the right faith. Thus *Vigilius* consenting now with the Emperour, defending his Imperiall Edict, and condemning the three Chapters, in all which, his profession was Catholike and orthodoxall:

7. When *Vigilius* was thus turned an Imperialist, and in regard of his outward profession declared in his Constitution, become orthodoxall, (though as it seemeth he remained in heart hereticall) hee fell into so great dislike of those who defended the three Chapters, that they did *proclamare*, proclame him to be a colluder, a prevaricator or betrayer of the faith; one, who to please the Emperour revolted from his former judgement; yea the Africane Bishops proceeded so farre against him, that, as *Victor* Bishop of *Tunen* testifieth, *Synodaliter eum a catholica communione recludunt*, they in a Synod, and synodally excommunicated him, or shut him from the Catholike communion. A thing worthy observing, being done by those whom the Cardinali professeth to have beene Catholikes at that time. But let that passe: *Baronius* to excuse *Vigilius* from those imputations of colluder and prevaricator, and to shew that hee was not in heart affected with the truth, which in his Constitution he declared, tells us a rare policy of the Pope, which for this time we omit, but hereafter will examine the truth and validity thereof, and this it was. *Mox*, presently after *Vigilius* had made that Apostolicall decree for condemning the three Chapters, he revoked the same, (touched belike with remorse for so hainous a crime, as to professe the Catholike faith) and he suspended it, and his owne judgement in that cause, till the time of a generall Councell: decreeing, that untill that time all men should be whit,

d. An. 547.

l. An. 547.

c. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

g. l. bid.

and silent in this cause of faith, they must neither say that the *Three Chapters* were to bee defended, nor condemned; they must neither speake one word for the truth, nor against the truth, they must all (during that time) be like himselfe, lukewarme Laodiceans, neither hot nor cold, neither fish nor flesh. This was the great wisdom and policy of the Pope, as *Baronius* at large declares, and makes no small boast thereof, adding <sup>p</sup> that the Pope remained in this mood till the time of the generall Council. Thus you see the second judgement of Pope *Vigilius* in this cause, and his carriage during the second period, for a fit (which perhaps lasted a weeke or a month) hee was in outward profession *orthodoxall*, but being weary of such an ague, hee presently becomes a meere neutralist in the faith; and in this sort hee continued till the assembling of the generall Councell, that is, for the space of six yeares and more.

*p. Abbas anno (347) ad tempus Concilij indictum (sicut au- tem an. 553) fuit in causa silentium, ibid. an. 43.*

*q. Sup. ca. 3. n. 4. & seq.*

8. The third period begins at the time of the fift generall Councell: Of what judgement the Pope then was, it hath before beene sufficiently declared. Then *Vigilius* turned to his old byas, hee condemned the Emperours Edict, and all that with it condemned the *three Chapters*: he defends those *three hereticall chapters*, and that after a most authentick manner, publishing a Synodall, a Cathedrall and Apostolicall constitution in defence of the same. And whereas not only others, but himselfe also, had written, and some sixe yeares before, made a Constitution to condemne those Chapters: Now after long and diligent ponderation of the cause, when hee had examined all matters, *cum omni indig. cautela, with all minifesse and circumspection*, that could possible be used: he quite casheires, repeales, and for ever adnuls that former Constitution, and whatsoever either himselfe or any other, either had before written or should after that time, write contrary to this present Decree. And this no doubt was the reason why *Baronius* never so much as once endeavors to excuse *Vigilius* by that former decree, or to prove him to have beene orthodoxall, by it: seeing by this later the whole force and vertue of that former is utterly made void, frustrate and of no effect in the world. In this judgement *Vigilius* was so resolute, that hee was ready to endure any disgrace and punishment, rather then consent to the condemning of the *three Chapters*: and if wee may beleieve *Baronius* or *Binius*, he did for this very cause endure banishment. It is manifest faith *Binius*, that after the end of the fift Councell *Iustinian* did cast into banishment both *Vigilius* and other orthodoxall Bishops, (so hee termeth convicted and condemned heretikes) because they would not consent to the decrees of the Synod, and condemning of the *three Chapters*. In like sort *Baronius*, *Liquet* ex *Anastasio*, it is manifest by *Anastasius*, that *Vigilius* and those who held with him were caried into banishment. Again, others thought they had a just quarrell in defending the *three Chapters*: when they saw *Vigilius* even banishment to maintaine the same, and they thought, *se pro sacrosanctis pugnare legibus*, that they fought for the holy faith; when they saw Pope *Vigilius* himselfe, for the same cause, *constanti animo exilium ferre*, to endure banishment with a constant minde. Again, *Horus* *solum causa, for this cause onely was Vigilius driven into banishment*, be-

*Si quid de isdem capitulis contra hac que hic asserimus vel statimus factum, dictum atq. conscriptum est, nullum, hoc modis omnibus ex auctoritate sedis Apostolicæ refutamus. Const. Vigil. in fine.*

*YNol. in Conc. 7. 6. Prohibuit.*

*an. 553. n. 222. in ibid. an. 251.*

*an. 554. n. 6.*

cause he would not condemne the Three Chapters. So *Baronius*: who often calleth this exiling of *Vigilius* and others, who defended those Chapters; persecution, yea, an heavy and monstrous persecution, complaining that the Church under *Iustinian* and from him, endured more hard conditions, and was in worse case then under the Heathen Emperors.

9. Now this demonstrates that which before I touched, that though the Pope upon his coming to *Constantinople*, made a decree for condemning the Three Chapters, yet still hee was in heart an affectionate lover of *Nestorianisme*, and a defender of those Chapters, seeing for his love to them, and defence of them, he is ready not onely to be bound, but to goe, and dye in banishment for his zeale unto them. For had he sincerely embraced the truth, (as in his former Constitution he professed,) why doth he now at the time of the fifth Councell, disclame the same? Of all times this was the fittest to stand constantly to the faith, seeing now both the glory of God, the good and peace of the Church, the authority of the Emperor, the example of orthodoxall Bishops, and the whole Councell invited, urged, and provoked him to this holy duty. What was there or could there be to move him at this time, to defend the 3. Chapters, save only his ardent and inward love to *Nestorianisme*? Indeed had he continued in defence of those Chapters untill this time; and now relented or changed his judgement, it would have bin vehemently suspected, that not the hatred of those chapters, or of *Nestorianisme*, but either the favour of the Emperor, or the importunity of the Easterne Bishops, or the feare of exile, or deprivation, or some such punishment had extorted that sentence and confession from him: But now when hee decreeth contrary to the Emperour, to the generall Councell, and to his owne former and true judgement; when by publishing this Decree, he was sure to gaine nothing, but the censure of an unconstant and wavering minded man, the *Anathema* of the whole generall Councell, and the heavy indignation of the Emperor; when he goes thus against the maine current & streame of the time, who can thinke, but that his onely motive to doe this, was his zeale and love to *Nestorianisme*? Love (specially of heresie) is strong as death. It will cause *Vigilius*, or any like him, when it hath once got possession of their heart, with the *Baulites* and *Donatists*, to contemne launcing, whipping, and tearing of their flesh, yea to delight as much in *Phalaris* Bull, as in a bed of downe, and in the midst of all tortures to sing with him in the Orator, *Quam suave est hoc? Quam nihil curo?* O how glad and merry a man am I, that suffer all these for the love of my Three Chapters? Losse of fame; losse of goods; losse of libertie, losse of my Countrey; losse of my pontificall See; losse of communion and society of the Catholike Church; and of God himselfe: Farewell all these; and all things else; rather then the Three Chapters, then *Nestorianisme* shall want a defender; or a Martyr to seale it with blood.

10. You see now the third period, and the third judgement of Pope *Vigilius* in this cause. A judgement, which being delivered on the Tripode, and with all possible circumspection, puts downe for many

y illi tantum  
immunes a  
persecutione  
erant, & c. an.

553. nu. 122.

z. Quod non  
profus accessit,  
ab Imperatore  
persecutio exci-  
tata est, & haud  
quidem levis.  
ibid. nu. 121.

a Cant. 8. 3.

b Tusc. quest.  
lib. 2.



respects both the former, what hee spake the first time in defence of these *Three Chapters*, was spoken in stomacke, and in his heart and choller against the Emperor. What he spake the second time for condemning those Chapters, he did therein but temporize and curry favours with the Emperor. But what he spake now this third time, after seven yeares ventilating of the cause, when all heat and passion being abated, he was in cold blood, and in such a calme, that no perturbation did trouble his mind, or darken his judgement, that I say, proceeded from the very bottome of the heart, and from the *Apostolicall* authority of his *infallible* Chaire, which to be a true and divine judgement, he like a worthy Confessor, sealed with his banishment. And of this judgement hee continued in likelihood more, but as *Baronius* (whom I now follow) tells us, about the space of a yeare after the end of the fifth Councell, even till hee returned out of exile unto *Constantinople*.

c An. 554. &  
555.

d Bar. an. 553.  
nu. 235.

e Synodum s.  
eadem Aposto-  
lica autoritate  
comprobasse satis  
apparet. Bar. an.  
554. nu. 7. &  
Bini. loc. cit. S.  
Praefat. 11.  
f Ibid.  
g Ibid. S. Tunc.

h An. 554. nu. 4.

i Ibidem.

k Extat in fine  
Novell.

l Conc. 5. coll. 8.

m Bar. & Bini.  
loci cit.  
n Bar. an. 555.  
nu. 2.

11. The fourth and last changing of *Vigilius* was after his returne from banishment, as *Baronius* and *Binius* tell us. For while hee was there, he saw there was *urgensissima causa*, a most urgent cause why he should consent to the Emperour, and approve the judgement of the holy Councell; and therefore hee was pleased once againe to make another *Apostolicall* Decree, for aduulling his former *Apostolicall* judgement, and for condemning the *Three Chapters*, and confirming the fifth Synod. I thinke, saith *Binius*, that *Vigilius* confirmed the fifth Synod by his Decree and Pontificall authority, and abrogated his former Constitution made in defence of the *Three Chapters* in the next yeare after the Councell was ended; when he being loosed from banishment, was suffered to returne into Italy, being adorned with sundry gifts and privileges. Neither doth he only opinari, but he is certaine of it. *Dubium* none is, there is no doubt, but *Vigilius* being delivered from exile, by the entreatie of *Narses*, did confirme the fifth Synod. We thinke, saith *Baronius*, that when *Vigilius* was by the intreaty of *Narses* freed from exile, hee did then assent to the Emperour, and recalling his former sentence, in his Constitution declared, did approve the fifth Synod. Again, Seeing we have declared, that *Vigilius* did not approve the fifth Synod, when hee was driven into banishment, for he was exiled for no other cause, but for that hee would not approve that Synod: Necessesse est affirmare, it must of necessity be said, that hee did this (approve the fifth Synod;) at this time, when being loosed out of exile, he was sent home to his owne Church. So *Baronius*. Now seeing hee returned home after hee had obtained those ample gifts and privileges, which they so magnifie, and which are set downe in that pragmaticall sanction of *Iustinian*, which was dated on the twelfth day of August, in the eight and twentieth yeare of his Empire: and the fifth Councell was ended on the second day of June in his seven and twentieth yeare; it is cleare, that this his last change was made about an whole yeare after the end of the fifth Councell, after hee had remained a yeare or thereabouts in banishment. And in this minde, as they tell us, hee returned towards *Rome*, but by the way, while hee was yet but in *Sicily*, being afflicted with the stone, he dyed.

12. Here

12. Here is now the *Catastrophe* of the Popes turnings and returnings, and often changing in this cause of faith: Concerning which this is especially to bee remembred, that whereas all the three former judgements of *Vigilius*, the first, when he defended those three Chapters, being in *Italie*, the second, when he condemned them upon his comming to *Constantinople*, and the third, when he againe defended them at the time of the Councell, and after, have all of them certaine and undeniable proofes out of antiquitie, such as the testimonies of *Facundus*, *Victor*, *Liberatus*, the Popes owne letters and Constitutions, together with the wimesse of the Emperour, and the whole fift Councell; onely this last period, and this last change, when hee consented to the fift Councell, and condemned the *Three Chapters*, This I say, which is the onely judgement whereby *Vigilius* is excused from heresie, is utterly destitute of all ancient witnesses, not any one that I can finde makes mention of this change, or of ought that can any way enforce the same, and therefore this may and must be called the *Baronian* change or Period, he being the first man, that I can learne of, who ever mentioned or dreamed of this change. And although this alone were sufficient to oppose to all that the Cardinall or any other can hence collect in excuse of *Vigilius*, reason and equitie forbidding us to bee too credulous upon the Cardinals bare word, (which even in this one cause touching the Three Chapters, and this fift Councell, besides many the like, demonstratively to be proved untrue and false, I speake it confidently and within compasse, in six hundreth sayings at the least) yet that they may not say wee decline the force of this so pregnant an exception, we will for a little while admit and suppose it to bee true, and try, whether by this being yeelded unto them, there can accrew any advantage to their cause, or any help to excuse either *Vigilius* himselfe, or his *Constitution* set forth in defence of the *Three Chapters*, from being hereticall.

13. Say you *Vigilius* by his last decree confirmed the fift Councell and approved the Catholike faith? Be it so, we deny not but that *Vigilius*, or any other of their Popes may decree, and have decreed a truth, thats not the doubt betwixt us and them. The question is, whether any of their Popes have at any time by his *Cathedrall* authoritie, and teaching, as Popes, decreed an heresie, or untruth. That Pope *Vigilius* did so, his *Apostolicall Constitution* in defence of the *Three Chapters*, is an eternall witnes against them, a monument *are perennius*. Had *Baronius* said that *Vigilius* never decreed the defending of those Chapters, he had fully cleared him in this matter, if he could have proved what he had said. But seeing undeniable records testifie, and the Cardinall himselfe with a Stentors voice proclame, this to be the true and undoubted *Constitution* of Pope *Vigilius*; though hee had revoked and repealed it a thousand times, yet can not this quit his former *Apostolicall* Decree from being hereticall, nor excuse their pontificall chaire from being fallible. It is nothing at all materiall which of the Popes Cathedrall Decrees, the first, last, or middle bee hereticall: If any one of them all bee: wee desire no more, the field is wonne.

The pope is not  
constable in a  
matter of faith.

the pope hath de-  
creed hereby for  
truth.

14. Say you *Vigilius* by an *Apostolicall* decree, confirmed the first Councell? Then did hee certainly decree that all writings defending the *Three Chapters*, doe defend heresie: and that all persons who defend those Chapters, for so long time as they defend them, after the judgement of that Councell, are convicted and condemned hereticks. Then the former *Constitution* of Pope *Vigilius*, set forth by his *Apostolicall* authoritie in the time of the Councell, in defence of those Chapters, is now by Popes *Vigilius* himselfe and by his *Apostolicall* authority and *infallible* Chaire declared to bee hereticall; and *Vigilius* himselfe for that yeare after the Councell, is now by *Vigilius* himselfe pronounced to bee an Hereticke; yea a definer of heresie, *Vigilius* now orthodoxal decreeth himselfe to have been before heretical. Nay it further followeth, that by confirming that Councell, hee confirmeth, and that by an *Apostolicall* and *infallible* Decree, that all who defend the Popes *Cathedrall* sentence in causes of faith, to bee *infallible*, are convicted and accursed hereticks, for by defending that position, they do *eo ipso* defend that *Constitutio* of *Vigilius* made in defence of the *Three Chapters* to bee true, *infallible*; and orthodoxall, which *Vigilius* himselfe by an *infallible* decree hath declared to bee erroneous, and hereticall. So far is this last and *Baronian* change from excusing *Vigilius* in this cause, that upon the admission thereof it doth inevitably ensue, both that *Vigilius* was an hereticke and a definer of heresie, and that all who defend the Popes *Cathedrall* *infallibilitie*, in causes of faith, that is, al who are members of their present *Romane Church*, to bee not onely heretickes, and for such condemned and accursed, but defenders also of a condemned and accursed heresie, even by the *infallible* judgement and decree of Pope *Vigilius*.

6 Cum sepe sententia mutavit, haud arguendus est levitatis. an. 553. nu. 235.  
 7 Cur ei non licuit mutato rerum statu mutare sententiam? ibid. nu. 237. & iure meritoque mutavit sententiam. Bin. S. Cum igitur Vigilius magna consideratione adhibita atque prudentia, diverso modo pugnat. an. 553. nu. 50.  
 8 Summa consuetudine specimen edidit. ibid. nu. 49.  
 9 An. 551. nu. 5.  
 10 An. 553. nu. 251.  
 11 An. 547. nu. 41.  
 12 Prudens & pius pontifex hac in re prudenter est imitatus S. Paulum. Bin. in E. di. nu. 11. 70. 2. pa. 499. S. Cum, & Bar. an. 553. nu. 235.

15. Their whole reason whereby *Vigilius* might bee excused, being now fully dissolved; There remaineth one point, which *Baronius*, and after him *Binius*, observeth, touching this often changing of *Vigilius*: which being a point of speciall note, I should wrong both *Vigilius* and *Baronius* if I should over-passe the same. Some men when they heare of these often changings, windings, and turnings of Pope *Vigilius* in this cause of faith, and of his banishment for defending a condemned heresie, will perhaps imagine this to bee a token of some levitie, unconstancie, or folly in the Pope. O fie! It was not so, saith *Baronius*; What hee did was not onely lawfull, done by good right and reason, but it was laudable also, done with great wisdom, and consideration. *Vigilius*, a man of greatest constancie; One who stood up with courage for defence of the Church, adversus violentum ecclesia grassatorem, against *Iustinian*, a violent oppressor thereof: one who fought for the sacred lawes, enduring exile, constanti animo, with a constant minde for the same. One who did by this meanes wisely, yea, prudently, most wisely provide for the good of the Church. One who in this doing did wisely imitate *Saint Paul*, who condemned circumcision, and yet when hee circumcised *Timothie*, approved circumcision. And though there bee a marvellous dissimilitude in their actions, the one change being in a mutable, &c, at that time, an indifferent ceremonie, the other being in an immutable doctrine of faith; Yet thus do they please themselves, and



and applaud the Pope in these his wise and worthy changes.

16. Now in stead of a better conclusion to this Chapter, I will entertaine the reader to observe with me two things touching their commending *Vigilius* in this manner. The former is, what an happie thing it is to be a Pope, or have a Cardinall for his spokesman. Let *Luther*, *Cranmer*, or a Protestant make farre lesse change than did *Vigilius*, what shall they not heare? An Apostate, unconstant, inconsiderate, a Chamellion, a Polipus, another Proteus, even *Vertumnus* himselfe. Let the Pope say and gaine say the same doctrine of faith, and then ex *Cathedra* define both his sayings being contradictorie, to bee not onely true, but *infallible* truths of the Catholike faith: O, It is all done with rare wisdom, with great reason, and consideration, The Pope in all this deales wisely, and that in the superlative degree. If when he is absent from the Emperor, he oppugne the truth published by the Emperors edict, It is wisely done; Kings and Emperors may not make Lawes in causes of faith, no nor for the faith; The Cöbler must not goe beyond his latcher. If when hee is brought before the Emperor, he sing a new song, and say just as the Emperor saith, *Ait, aio: Negas, nego*: It is wisely done, *principibus placuisse viris*, for the Kings wrath is the messenger of death. If after both these hee become a meere Neutralist and Ambodexter in faith, holding communion with all sides, Catholikes, heretickes, and all, this is also an act of rare wisdom, the Pope is now become another Saint *Paul*, *factus est omnia omnibus*, with Catholikes he's a Catholike, that he may gaine Catholikes, with Heretickes, he's an Hereticke, that he may gaine heretickes, he's all with all, that hee may gaine them all. If when the Emperor, the generall Councell, the whole Church calls for his resolution in a cause of faith, if then hee step into his *infallible* Chaire, and thence by his *Apostolicall* authoritie define, that the *three Chapters*, that is, that Nestorianisme shall for ever bee held for the Catholike faith, O wisely done, he now drops oracles from heaven, in *Cathedra sedet*, the voice of God, and not of man. If, when hee is banished for his obstinacie against the truth, upon some urgent cause which then he discernes, he calls againe for his holy Trevit, and thence decrees the quite contradictorie to his former *Apostolicall* sentence, In this he's wiser then in all the rest: for by this he shews that he's more wise and powerfull then all the Prophets and Apostles ever were; They silly men could make but the one part of a contradiction to be true, but the Pope he is *tanto potentior Prophetis*, so much more wise and powerfull then all the Prophets, that hee can make both parts of a contradiction to be *infallible* truths, and unto which of the Prophets was it ever said, *Tu es Petra*? But the Pope is a Rocke indeed, a Rocke upon which you may build two contradictories in the doctrine of faith, and in them both say unto him, *Tu es Petra*. Such a Rocke neither the Prophets, nor Apostles, nor Christ himselfe ever was. So wise, so exceeding wise is the Pope, in all his turnings, even as wise as a wethercocke for turning with the wind and weather.

17. Againe, when the Pope, his instruments or Inquisitors (to whom *Phalaris*, *Bufris*, and all the heathen persecutors may yeeld) exercise

*the pope factus  
est omnia omnibus:  
ait aio, negat  
ne go:*

*Y Tanta ipse pa-  
tention est Pro-  
phetis effectus,  
quanto differen-  
tius prae illis no-  
men heredita-  
vit. Nam cui  
prophetarum ali-  
quando dictum est,  
Tu es Petra?  
Bar. an. 552,  
nu. 9.*

exercise against us for maintaining the truth of God, all exquisite & hellish tortures (to which the old heathenish were but *ludus & jocus*) all which they doe must be extolled as due punishments, and just censures of the Holy Father of the holy Church, of the Holy inquisition, of the Holy house, all must be covered with the mantle of holinesse. On the other side, when they resist the most religious lawes, or Edicts of Kings or Emperors, when *Vigilius* or any of them (being by an holy generall Councell declared, and condemned for an Hereticke,) are for their obstinate rebellion against the truth justly punished, though *Iustinian* yea Iustice it selfe, shall use rather moderate then severe correction against them, they forsooth must be accompted catholikes: Cōfessers, & holy Martyrs, such as suffer for religion, for the sacred lawes, and for the Catholike faith; but *Iustinian* the Defender of the faith, must be called *Julian*, Iustice be termed *Scelus* <sup>2</sup>, and the Church for that cause said to be in farre worse condition, then in the times of *Nero*, *Dioclesian*, or any of the heathen Tyrants. Such an happie thing it is to be a Pope, or Papist, for then their wavering shall be Constancie; their rebellion, Religion and fortitude: their folly, greate and rare wisdom: their heresie, Catholike doctrine: and their most condigne punishments shall be crowned with Martyrdome.

18. The other thing which I observe, is, what a strong faith, Papists had need to have, who rely upon the Popes judgement, which changeth out and in, in and out so many times: who yet are bound to beleve the Pope *definitive* sentences in causes of faith, that is, to speake in plaine tearmes, who are bound to beleve two contradictories to be both true, both of them the infallible oracles of God. Or if any of them have so weake a faith, that he can but beleve the one, I would gladly learne of some who is an *Oedipus* among them, In this case of two Contradictorie *Cathedrall* decrees, such as were these of Pope *Vigilius*, whether of the Popes definitive judgements, that is, according to their language, whether of the sayings of God is true, and whether false, or what strength the one hath, more then the other. If the Apostolicall sentence of *Vigilius* delivered *cum omni undique cautela*, and by his *Cathedrall* authoritie, in defence of the *Three Chapters*, be repealeable by a second, why may not the second (which cannot possibly have more authoritie) be repealed by a third, and the third by a fourth, and fourth by a fift, and so *in Infinitum*? If the Pope after seaven yeares deliberation and ventilating of the cause, while hee is all that time in peace, and libertie, may be deceived in his iudiciall and *Cathedrall* sentence in a cause of faith, how may wee be assured, that when some yeares after that, the tediousnesse of exile and desire of his pristine libertie and honour perswades him to make a contrary decree, he may not therein also be deceived? If the Popes decrees made in libertie, peace and prosperity be of force, why shall not the decree of *Vigilius* in defence of the *Three Chapters*, be an article of faith? If those free decrees may be admitted by a stronger sentence when the Pope is in banishment, how may any beleve their *Lateran* and *Trent* decrees, as doctrines of faith? For why may there not once againe,

2 Vidisti Scelus,  
c. Bar. an. 554.  
24.2.

not 2409  
not 2409  
not 2409  
not 2409  
not 2409

again, come some other *Iustinian*, into the world, (as great pirie it is but there should) who in these, or future times may minister that soveraigne medicine to cleare the Popes judgement, and restraine, or close him up in some meaner estate, and farre lower place, whence, as out of a darke and low pit, he may discern those coelestiall truths in the Word of God, like so many Starres in heaven, which now being invironed with the circumsused splendor of the Romane Court, he cannot possibly behold. If those *Three Chapters* were to bee condemned, why did the Pope defend them at the time of the Councell? If they were to be defended, why did he condemne them after his returne from exile? Nay, if the *Three Chapters* were orthodoxall, why did the Pope at any time first or last by his *Apostolicall* sentence condemne them? If they were hereticall, why did he at any time, first or last, by his *Cathedral* and *Apostolicall* sentence defend them? I confesse I am here in a Labyrinth; if any of the Cardinals friends will winde mee out, he shall for ever be *Thesens* unto me.

## CAP. XVI.

That the Decree of Vigilius for Taciturnity touching the Three Chapters, and the Councell, wherein it is supposed to be made, and all the Consequents upon that Decree, painted out by Baronius, are all fictitious; and Poeticall.



THE whole reason of *Baronius* drawne from *Vigilius* his confirming of the fift Councell, being now fully dissolved, we might without further stay, and I gladly would, according to my intended order in the Treatise, proceed to his next exceptio: but there are two points in this last passage, touching the changings of *Vigilius*, which, even against my will, pull mee backe, and call me to examine what *Baronius* sets downe, and with exceeding ostentation paints out, in his Annals, concerning them; the due consideration whereof will cause any man to admire the Cardinals most audacious, and shamelesse dealing in Synodall affaires, and causes of the Church: The one of them concernes the second, the other the fourth period in *Vigilius* changings. The former is this.

As soone as the defenders of the *Three Chapters* had notice of that Iudiciall sentence, and Decree published by *Vigilius* against the same Chapters, upon his comming to *Constantinople*, they began to shorne thereat, and condemne *Vigilius* as a Prevaricator, or revolter from the faith; whereupon *Vigilius*, as the Cardinall tels us, put in practice a rare peece of wisdom<sup>b</sup>; and of his Pontificall pollicy, *sententiam emissam* <sup>c</sup> *non suspendit, sed potius revocavit*, he suspends and revokes that his late judgement; & runs forth ab eo promulgatum decretum, quo decrebatur ut penitus taceretur, and he published a new Decree, wherein he decreed, that every man should be silent, and say never a word; either

pro;



d Ab hoc anno,  
ad illud usque  
tempus. Ibid.  
nu. 43.  
e Bar. ibid. nu. 26  
f Ibid. nu. 48

g Bar. an. 551.  
nu. 2.  
h Ibid. nu. 3.

Bar. an. 547.  
nu. 43.

k Justinianus  
contra praece-  
dentis Synodi  
decretū, et emis-  
sam sponsonem  
de servando usq[ue]  
ad Concilium u-  
niversale silēti-  
o, appendi iussit E-  
dictum. Bar. an.  
551. nu. 2.

l Bar. an. 547.  
nu. 41.

m Nam decretū  
editum an. 547.  
Bar. eo an. nu.  
43. ista an-  
tem gesta an. 551  
Bar. eo an. nu. 2.  
n Bar. an. 551.  
nu. 5.

o Sententiam  
excommunicati-  
onis interquet.  
Ibid. Verba exco-  
municacionis ex-  
tant. Ibid. nu. 11  
et 12.

p Ibid. nu. 11.

q Justinianus  
contra Synodi  
decretum publi-  
cē appendi iussit  
Edictum. Ibid.  
nu. 2.

r Ibid. et confu-  
gere ocellum off.

Bar. an. 551.  
nu. 2.

s Nec facer ille  
locus asylum lau-  
di Pontifici. Ibid.

Bar. an. 551.  
nu. 2.

t Deit aliam in faciem. Ibid.

y Trans mare que  
fuit officium. Ibid.

z Nisi  
genitum remissi  
Apostolica authoritate.

Ibid. nu. 9. et 10.

a Idem ille locum officium est. Pontifici  
Romani presentia. prout  
ex illis que per hunc ad iudicandum tribunal. Ibid. nu. 10.

b Nisi in hostes facit, potentissimaeque spirituales p[ro]-

pro, or *contra*, touching that question of the *Three Chapters*, till the time of the generall Council, from <sup>a</sup> this yeare (which was the 21<sup>o</sup> of *Iustinian*, & the same wherein *Vigilius* came to *Constantinople*) until the time of the generall Council, in *ea causa ab ipso Vigilio indictū fuit Silentium*, Silence was enjoined every man in that cause, by Pope *Vigilius*: & againe, *Tacendū indixit*, he enjoined Silence in that cause; and very often doth the Cardinall, with no small comfort, mention this Decree of *Taciturnity*. And, for the more solemnitie of the matter, *Vigilius* decreed this in a Council, it was not onely his, but, *decretum Synodi*, the decree of a Council, together with the Pope. *Vigilius Synodicē statuit tacendū esse*, *Vigilius* decreed in, and with a Synod, that there should be a Silence in this cause, untill the generall Council: To which Synodall decree, not onely *Mennas*, and *Theodorus* Bishop of *Cesarea*, but <sup>k</sup> *Iustinian* himselfe also consented, and promised to observe the same. This was the Decree, see now the effects, and Cōsequents which ensued thereupon, declared also by *Baronius*.

3. This Decree tooke so good effect at the first, that, *res aliquandiu consopita siluit*, for a space, all matters, touching the *Three Chapters*, were hush't asleepe, not a word spoken of that Controversie: But some foure yeares <sup>m</sup> after the publishing thereof, when *Vigilius* saw divers contrary to his decree, to condemne the *Three Chapters*, <sup>n</sup> *erigē sa*, he raiſed up himselfe for defence thereof, and <sup>o</sup> excommunicated *Mennas* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, *Theodorus* Bishop of *Cesarea*, and many moe; and this also he did in another Council consisting of thirtene <sup>p</sup> Bishops besides himselfe. Yea and whereas the Emperour in that yeare published, or hung out his Edict against the same Chapters contrary to his owne promise, and the Decree for *Taciturnity*, the Pope withstood him so long, and so eagerly, that *Iustinian* began to rage, to use threats, and violence against him, so that the Pope, in *fuga tantum spem posuit*, was forced to flee from him out of the house where he dwelled, called (for good lucke sake) *Placidiana*, unto the Church of Saint *Peter*, where he remained a time, in *adversarius sententiam ferens*, thundering out his censures against his adversaries. But that sacred place <sup>r</sup> could be no Sanctuary for *Vigilius*; they buffeted <sup>s</sup> and beate him on his face; they called him an homicide, a murderer of *Sylvester*, and of the widowes sonne: whereupon hee, to avoid the fury <sup>t</sup> and violence of the sacrilegious Emperour, fled <sup>v</sup> from *Constantinople* to *Chalcedon*, and there lived in the Church of Saint *Euphemia*, taking hold of a Piller or Horne of the Altar: And even there, though in persecution, and affliction, he bated <sup>x</sup> not one Ace of his Apostolical authority; but, as if he had lived in peace, and beene in the *Literae* or *Vaticane*, he ascends into his Apostolike Throne <sup>y</sup>, and high Tribunal; and thence, by the fulnesse of his Apostolical power, he <sup>z</sup> throwes out his darts, represseth and prostrateth his adversaries; pronounceth

<sup>a</sup> Deit aliam in faciem. Ibid. <sup>x</sup> Ab Imperatoris furorē, & ab Imperatoris sacrilegi contētia. Ibid. <sup>y</sup> Trans mare que fuit officium. Ibid. <sup>z</sup> Nisi genitum remissi Apostolica authoritate. Ibid. nu. 9. et 10. <sup>a</sup> Idem ille locum officium est. Pontifici Romani presentia. prout ex illis que per hunc ad iudicandum tribunal. Ibid. nu. 10. <sup>b</sup> Nisi in hostes facit, potentissimaeque spirituales p[ro]-



to the Pope being restored to his former dignitie, *animus junctus*, their  
 minds being joyned together, the generall Councell, long wished for by  
*Vigilius*, was summoned against the moneth of May, in the twenty se-  
 venth yeare of *Iustinian*. This is the summe of the narration of *Baro-*  
*nius*, touching the Decree of *Taciturnity*, and the manifold consequents  
 thereof.

5. Concerning which, none I thinke can judge otherwise, but that  
*Baronius*, as he is miserably infatuated in this whole cause of the *three*  
*Chapters*, so, in this passage, hee was growne to that extremity of do-  
 rage, that hee seems utterly to have beene bereft, both of common  
 sense, and reason: For I doe constantly avouch, that in no part of all  
 this his narration, (which, as you see, is very large and copious, and  
 runneth, like a great fireame, through divers yeares in *Baronius* An-  
 nals) there is any truth at all. No such Decree of *Taciturnity* ever made  
 by *Vigilius*; no Synod wherein it was decreed; no assent, either of  
*Mennas*, or *Theodorus*, or the Emperour unto it; no violating of that  
 Decree by *Mennas*, or *Theodorus*; no excommunication of them, or o-  
 ther Bishops, for doing contrary to it; no hanging up of the Empe-  
 rours Edict after it; no resistance made by *Vigilius* against the Empe-  
 rour; no persecuting of *Vigilius*; no buffeting of him; no objecting  
 of murder unto him; no fleeing either to Saint *Peters* Church, or to  
*Chalcedon*; no thundring out from thence of his Pontificall Censures;  
 no embassage sent from the Emperour to call him thence; no such  
 magnanimities in *Vigilius* as to refuse to returne; no recalling, or ab-  
 rogating of the Emperiall Edict by the Emperour; no submission of  
*Mennas*, or *Theodorus* to the Pope; no solemnizing of the *Encenia* for  
 those three Apostles at that time by *Mennas*; no carying of those holy  
 reliques in a triumphing manner, and in a golden Chariot; no laying  
 them up by *Mennas*; and, in a word, in that whole passage of *Baro-*  
*nius*, there is not so much as one dramme, nor one syllable of truth.  
 The Cardinall from an Historian is here quite metamorphozed into  
 a Poet, into a Fabler, and in stead of writing Annals, matters of fact,  
 and reall truths, he guls his readers with fictitious, anile, and more than  
*Æsopical* fables.

6. For the clearing whereof I will begin with the Decree it selfe,  
 which is the ground of the whole fiction, and therefore if it bee de-  
 monstrated to bee but an idle dreame and fancie, all the rest, which  
 hang on it like so many consequents, and appendices, will of them-  
 selves fall to the ground. Nor doe I speake to disgrace this Decree, as  
 if *Baronius* could gaine ought thereby, though it were admitted and  
 granted unto him: For alas, what a poore pollicy or peece of wise-  
 dome was this in the Pope, being a Iudge infallible, to command, and  
 decree by his Apostolicall authority, that for five or sixe, or, as it might  
 have hapned, for forty or sixty yeares together, no man should speake  
 a word in this cause of faith, neither condemne the *three Chapters*, nor  
 defend the same; which is in effect, that they should neither speake a-  
 gainst, nor for Nestorianisme; neither dare to say, that Christ is God,  
 nor, that he is not God, but suspend their judgement in them both;  
 that for all that time none should either be Catholikes, or heretikes,

but



but be like *Vigilius*, meere Neutralists in the faith, what other wisdom is this but that of the *Academics*, which Christ condemneth <sup>u</sup> *Apor. 3. 15.* I would thou werst either hot or cold, but because thou art neither hot nor cold, it will come to passe that I will spue thee out of my mouth: what other then that which *Eliac* reproves? Why halt yee betwene two opinions? If the Lord be God follow him, but if Baal, or Nestorianisme be he, goe after it. <sup>x i King. 18. 21.</sup> By this Decree of Taciturnity *Vigilius* provideth, that neither himselfe nor others should speake against the truth or condemne it. True, but that is not enough. He should have defended it also, and caused others by his instruction and example to doe the like. A Neutralist, *one that is not with Christ, is against Christ*: Hee that is not with the truth is against the truth. Silence where God commands to speake, is betraying of Gods truth. If the Heathen wife man <sup>y</sup> *Matth. 12. 30.* set this, and that justly among his eternall lawes, That he who in a publike division of the Common wealth, tooke part with neither side, should bee punished with losse of goods and banishment; how much more ought this to take place in *Vigilius* and all such *Mexy Suffery*, who in the publike rent of the Church and that for a cause of faith, will be of neither part, neither for God nor against him? Nay if we well consider, even for this very decree of silence, *Vigilius* is to bee judged an heretike; for the whole Councell of *Chalcedon* condemned *Domnus* Patriarch of *Antioch* as an Heretike, onely for this cause: for that hee writ that men should bee silent, and say nothing of the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*, as both *Infinian* and the first Councell <sup>b</sup> doe testifie. Did not *Vigilius*, if the Cardinall say true, teach, nay decree the very like silence concerning the *Three Chapters*, as *Domnus* did concerning those twelve of *Cyrill*? These Three doe as nearly concerne the faith, as did the other twelve. These three were as certainly condemned by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, as the other twelve were approved by the Councell of *Ephesus*. As *Domnus* by teaching silence in those of *Cyrill*, even thereby taught that men should not allow them, nor say that they might be allowed, and therein overthrew the faith of the Ephesine Councell, which approved them, and taught all men to approve them: Even so, *Vigilius* by decreeing silence in these *Three Chapters*, decreeth that none shall condemne them; or say they are to be condemned, and so overthroweth the Catholike faith which was declared at *Chalcedon*, whereby they are all three condemned, and taught that they ought to be condemned. If the teaching of silence in the one can make *Domnus* an heretike, certainly the decreeing of silence in the other, cannot chuse but make *Vigilius* an heretike. O but this decree was to continue but for a time, *Vigilius* would expect the assembling of a generall Councell, and then he would resolve the matter to the full. And you have seen how well he resolved it then. But what? Expect a Councell? why is not his Holinesse able to decide a doubt in faith, without a generall Councell? Is he not of himselfe infallible? Doth his infallibilitie like an Ague goe away, and come by fits upon him? Is the generall Councell that Angell which must move the Pole in the Popes brest, before he can teach infallibly? The Pope scornes to hold his infallibility

<sup>u</sup> *Apor. 3. 15.*  
16.

<sup>x i King. 18.</sup>  
21.

<sup>y</sup> *Matth. 12.*  
30.

<sup>z</sup> *Solanis lex*  
*apud A. Gellium*  
*lib. 2. ca. 12.*

<sup>a</sup> *Chalcedonensis S. Synodus*  
*Domnum condemnavit, quod ausus est scribere, oportere solum tacere 12. Capitula S. Cyrilli.*  
*Instit. in Edict. S. Quod autem.*  
<sup>b</sup> *Idem asserit plane Conc. 5.*  
*Col. 6. pa. 575. b*

*precaris*, by the curtesie either of the whole Church, or of any generall Councell: He is all-sufficient in himselfe, he gives to them *infallibility*, he receives none from them; what thinke you then was become of *Vigilius* his infallibility, that for deciding a doubt in faith, hee should suspend all in silence, and stay till the generall Councell be assembled, which, for ought he knew, might bee 60. or 100. yeares after? If of himselfe he was infallible, why did he hold men in suspence in the doctrine of faith? why did he not presently, and without the Councell infallibly decide it, and so set the Church at quiet? If of himselfe he was not infallible, how could he at the time of the Councell infallibly decide it; for they make not him or his sentence infallible, but all their infallibility is borrowed from him. So little helpe is there for them in this decree of taciturnity, (if wee should admit thereof) that in very deed, it doth many wayes prejudice their cause. It is not then the preventing of any advantage which hence they might have, that causeth me to reject this decree, but the onely love of the truth perswadeth me to enforce it herunto. For I professe I was not a little moved to see the Cardinalls Annalls so stuffed with untruths and figments, and see him also not onely by these to abuse, and that most vilely, his Readers, but even to vaunt and glory (as you have seene hee doth) in that which is, and will be an eternall ignominy unto him. But let us come to make evident the fiction of this Decree.

7. That *Vigilius* made no such decree of *Taciturnity*, first the Emperour *Iustinian* in his Letters to the first generall Councell is a wimes above exception, When Pope *Vigilius*, saith he, was come to this Princely City, we did accurately manifest unto him all things touching these three Chapters, and we demanded of him what he thought hereof: and he not once or twice, but often in writing, without writing, did anathematize the same Chapters. *Quod utro ejusdem voluntatis semper fuit de condemnatione trium Capitulorum, per plurima declaravit, and that he hath always, (ever since his comming hither) continued in the same minde of condemning those three Chapters, he hath very many wayes declared. And after repeating some of those particulars, hee adds; Et compendiose dicere, semper in eadem voluntate perseveravit, and so speake briefly, he hath ever since persevered in this minde. So writ and testified the Emperour. In the seventh Collation the Emperour sent Constantine the most glorious Quæstor of his Palace, unto the Synod, to deliver unto them certaine letters of *Vigilius*, who againe testified this from the Emperour before the whole Councell: *Vigilius*, saith he, hath very often manifested by writings his minde, that he condemneth the Three Chapters; which also without writing, he hath said before the Emperour in the presence of the most glorious Iudges, and of very many of your selves, who are here in the Councell: et non intermisit semper anathematizans Theodorum; and hee hath not intermitted or ever ceased (since his first comming almost to Constantinople) so anathematize the defenders of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and the Epistle of Ibas, and the writings of Theodoret against Cyrill: and then delivering the letters of *Vigilius* unto them, he addeth, *Vigilius* doth by these make manifest, quod per totum tempus, eundem trium Capitulorum imperatorem avertatur, that for this whole time (since his first consenting to the*

c Iust. Epist. 2  
ad 5. Synod.  
Coll. 1. pa. 520. a.

c Coll. 7. Conc. 5.  
pa. 578. a.

the Edi& upon his comming to *Constantinople*, untill the assembling of the generall Councell) *hee hath detested the impiety of those Three Chapters*. Thus said and testified *Constantine* from the Emperor.

8. If I should say no more at all, even this one testimony being so pregnant, and withall so certaine, that there can bee no doubt but the Emperor both knew and testified the truth herein, this alone, I say, is sufficient to demonstrate the vanity of that fictitious Synod & decree of *Taciturnity*. For seeing it is hence certaine, that *Vigilius* persisted and persevered to condemne the *Three Chapters*, after the time of his consenting to the Emperors Edi&, upon his comming to *Constantinople*, till the time of the fift Councell, it must needs be acknowledged for certaine, that in that time hee made no decree to forbid men to condemne the same; and then, not this decree of *Taciturnity*, which tyes all mens tongues that they shal neither defend, nor yet condemne them. And if the decree be fictitious, such as was never made, as by this testimony it is now certaine: then is the Councell fictitious wherein it was decreed; then the whole fable of *Baronius*, how the Emperor and *Mennas* violated that decree, how the Pope indured persecution for maintaining that Decree, and the other Consequents, they all are certainly fictitious, this one testimonie overthroweth the all. But I will adde a second reason drawne from the consideration of the observing and putting in execution this Synodall and pontificall Decree. For it is not to bee doubted, but if such a Decree had beene made, especially, with the consent of a Synod, and of the Emperour also, but some one or other would have observed the same; the rather, because *Baronius* tells us, that upon the publishing of this Decree in the one and twentieth yeare of *Iustinian*, *res consopita siluit*, the controversie was for a while hushd. Let us then see who those were whom this Decree made silent or tongue-tyed in this cause, and it will appeare that none at all observed it.

9. Let us begin with the Pope himselfe, who of all is most likely to have kept his owne decree; but he was so farre from observing it, that he practised the quite contrary. In the two and twentieth yeare of *Iustinian*, the very next unto that wherein this decree is supposed to be made, *Rusticus* and *Sebastianus* two Roman Deacons remaning then at *Constantinople*, and being earnest defenders of the *Three Chapters*, writ letters unto divers Bishops, and into divers Provinces against Pope *Vigilius*, and the cause was, for that he condemned the *Three Chapters*, and thereby as they pretended, condemned also the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and for a prooffe of their accusation they dispersed the copies of *Vigilius* his Constitution sent unto *Mennas* against the *Three Chapters*. A cleare prooffe that as then *Vigilius* neither had made this Decree, nor revoked his judgement for condemning of those Chapters. In the 23.<sup>h</sup> yeare, *Vigilius* writ to *Valentinianus*, to purge himselfe of those slanders and untruths, and that hee doth by referring himselfe to his judgement, sent to *Mennas* against the *Three Chapters*, wherein he then plainly professeth, that what he had therein defined was consonant to the faith of the 4. former Councells, and to the decrees of his predecessors, & he is so resolute in maintaining the same

d Bar. an. 547.  
nu. 41.  
e Hi adversus  
Rom. Pontificem  
in diversis pro-  
vincias literas  
dedit, Bar. an.  
548. nu. 2. in est  
juxta. Bar. an.  
Iustin. 22.  
f Schismatici  
scriptis ubiq;  
vulgaverant  
Vigilius tria  
damnando Ca-  
pitula impugna-  
re Chalcedonense  
Cuncilium. Bar.  
an 550. nu. 1.  
g Exemplaria  
(Iudicati no-  
stri) per plurimos  
sacerdotes et  
laicos in Africa-  
na Provincia  
destinatos ait  
Vig. Rustico et  
Sebastiano, in  
sua Epist. ad eos  
in Conc. 5. Coll. 7  
pa. 578. b.  
h Epistola Vigi-  
lij ad Valentinianum  
data est i 5.  
Kal. April. anno  
23. Iustiniani.  
exat in Conc. 5.  
Coll. 7. pa. 580.  
et seq.  
i Etiam hoc  
mentis sunt, etc.  
Epist. Vig. ib.  
pa. 581. a.  
k Legant qua  
de causa qua  
hic mota est ad  
fratrem nostrum  
Mennam scri-  
bentes legimus  
desinuisse, ibid.  
l Ibid.



in Credimus e-  
nim, catholica  
ecclesia filijs, ea  
que tunc ad  
Mēnam scrip-  
tus de blasphemis  
Theodori,  
ejusq; persona,  
deq; Epistola  
Ibe, & scriptis  
Theodori cōtra  
rectam fidem,  
abunde posse  
sufficere, ibid.  
n. Epistola Vigi-  
lij ad Aurel. da-  
ta est Kal. Mays  
an. 24. Iustiniani  
Augusti, extat  
in Conc. 5. Coll.  
7. p. 581. b.  
O ista hoc anno  
Constantinopoli  
à Vigilio ad-  
versus schisma-  
ticos decreta  
fuērunt. Bar.  
an. 550. (qui est  
Iustiniani 24.)  
nu. 36.  
p. Ea extat in  
Conc. 5. Coll. 7.  
p. 578. & seq.  
et eam recitat.  
Bar. an. 550. nu.  
16. & seq.  
q. Hi in senatū  
papa & decreta  
nominantur,  
apud Bar. an.  
eodem, nu. 34.  
x. Immutatum te  
comperimus, &  
cum adversarijs  
ecclesie qui con-  
tra Iudicati  
nostri seriem ni-  
tebantur se cau-  
te trāllare, &c.  
Vigil. in suo de-  
creto contra  
Ruff. & Sebast.  
apud Bar. an.  
550. nu. 22.

same judgement that he addeth of it, that it is abundant = to satisfie any man. An infallible evidence that as yet, nor till that year he had neither revoked his former sentence, nor made any decree of silence to forbid men to condemne the same Chapters. In the foure and twentieth<sup>a</sup> yeare hee writ the like Apology to *Aurelianus* Bishop of *Arles*, yea which is more, *Baronius* sheweth that in that 24. yeare, he published his judicall sentence of condemnation and deposition against *Ruffinus*, *Sebastianus*, *Gerontius*, & *Severus*, *Importunus*, *Iohn*, and *Deusdedit*; for that they by defending the *Three Chapters*, and communicating with such as defended them, contra Iudicati nostri seriem nitebantur, dealt against the tenor of his judgement: shewing plainly that till then, and in that yeare his judgement against the *Three Chapters* stood so firmly in force, that by a judicall sentence he deposed the contraditors thereof, which had himselfe revoked, and by a Decree of silence adnulled, in likelihood he wold not, certainly in justice he could not have done; and seeing hee censured them not for speaking of that controversie, but for speaking in defence of those Chapters: it is evident, that as then he had not made any Decree for silence in that cause, for then his censure should have beene, because they had done contrary to it, not because they had contradicted his judgement in condemning those Chapters.

10. Is not *Baronius* thinke you a very wise and worthy Annalist, who perswades you that *Vigilius* made this Decree of silence in the 21. yeare of *Iustinian*, forbidding all thereby to condemne the *Three Chapters*, which not to have been made either in the 22. or 23. or 24. yeares, the undoubted writing and censures of *Vigilius* expressed by *Baronius* himselfe doe make evident, and testifie that the Pope himselfe was so far from being silent therein, that both by words, by writings, by pontificall censures and judgements, himselfe condemned the 3. Chapters; who will again perswade you that the Pope suffered very heavy persecution at the Emperors hands, because he would not permit the 3. Chapters to be condemned, whereas the Pope himselfe, not onely condemned them all that time, as well as the Emperor did, but both by writings reproved, and by judicall censures punished, condemned, and deposed such as would not condemne them, and that also eo nomine, because they would not condemne them, nor consent to his judgement whereby he had condemned them. Now that *Vigilius* continued of the same mind, both in the 25. & 26. yeares of *Iustinian*, that is, untill the time that the fifth Councell was assembled, though there be no particulars to explaine, yet by the Emperours words before remembred, that *per totum tempus perseveravit*, and *eiusdem semper voluntas fuit*, it is abundantly testified. So that it is most certain, that *Vigilius* at no time observed this decree of Taciturnity: and because had there beene any, he of all men was the most likely to observe it; who as *Baronius* fableth, was so rigorous against others, even the Emperor also, for not observing thereof, his not observing of it, is an evidence that he made no such Decree at all, but that the whole narration concerning it, and the consequents upon it, is a very fiction and fable.

11. Next after the Pope let us see if the Emperor (who as *Baronius* saith<sup>a</sup>, promised to observe this law, of *Taciturnity*) was silent & quiet in this cause. And truly there is a strong presumption that he neither did nor would now refuse or forbear to condemn the 3. Chapters, seeing by so doing, he should have anathematized himselfe: for by his Imperiall Edict, he denouced all those to be an *Anathema*, who do not condemn and anathematize the same Chapters. The very silence in this cause, and ceasing or refusing to anathematize the Chapters, had made him guilty of his owne just *Anathema*. But to leave presumptions, Certaine it is that *Iustinian* continued the same man, constant in condemning those Chapters, and that not onely for the time after this supposed Decree, but from the first publishing of his own Edict, whereof the whole fift Councell is a most ample witness, who thus say<sup>b</sup>, *omnia semper fecit, & facit, quæ sanctam Ecclesiam & recta dogmata conservant*, The most pious Emperor hath ever done (concerning this cause of the three Chapters,) and now doth those things which preserve the holy Church, and sound doctrine, and that to be the condemning of these Chapters, they by their Synodall sentence doe make evident, where they professe the condemning thereof to bee the preserving of the good seed<sup>c</sup> of faith, the preserving of the Councell of Chalcedon, and the rooting out of hereticall tares.

12. And if wee desire particulars of his constant dealing herein, *Victor Tunauensis* declareth the earnestnesse of *Iustinian*, in condemning these Chapters for every yeare since this Decree of *Taciturnity* is supposed to have beene made. The Decree, as *Baronius* sheweth, was set out in the sixt yeare after the Consulship of *Basilus* (which account by Consular yeares *Victor* useth) and it answereth to the end of twenty one, and most of the 22. yeare of *Iustinian*. In the seaventh yeare after *Basilus*<sup>d</sup> *Coff.* that is, in the very next to that wherein the Decree was made, *Iustinian* writ most earnestly saith *Victor*<sup>e</sup> into divers provinces, & antistites cunctos prefata tria Capitula damnare compellit, and hee compelled all Bishops to condemn the Three Chapters. In the eight he sheweth that the Illyrian Bishops held a Synod, and writ unto the Emperour to dissuade him from condemning those Chapters. In the ninth he shewes that *Facundus* did the like, and further in this yeare<sup>f</sup> the Emperor commanded the Synod at *Mopsuestia* to be held against *Theodorus*, that it might appeare how, and from how long time before then, the name of *Theodorus* had beene blotted out of the Ecclesiasticall tables, the judgement of which Synod the Emperor sent<sup>g</sup> to *Vigilius* to assure him of the truth thereof, that hee might with more constancie continue to cōdemne the Three Chapters. In the tenth *Victor* declares that the Emperor sent for *Reparatus* and *Firmus* two Primates, for *Primassus* & *Verecundus*, two Bishops to deale with them, that they would condemn the same Chapters, and that *Zoilus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, for refusing to condemn them was deposed, which to have beene done by the Emperors command, *Liberatus* sheweth. In the eleventh, which was the next before the generall Councell, *Victor* tells us both that *Firmus* Primate of *Numidia* being wonne<sup>h</sup> by the Emperors gifts (so hee partially writeth) consented

f Bar. an. 551.  
nu. 2. emissi spō-  
sione de servado  
silento, &c.  
i Si quis nō an-  
themizat T he-  
odorū et i heodo-  
reti scripta, &c.  
g Apistola Ibe,  
Anathema sit E-  
dict. Iustin.  
u Conc. 5. coll. 7.  
in fine.  
x Festinantes bo-  
nū fidei semē pu-  
rum conservare  
ab impietatis Zi-  
ranis. Conc. 5.  
Coll. 8. pa. 584. a.  
y Bar. an. 547.  
nu. 1. & 41.  
z Victo. Tun. in  
l. hron. sed vitio  
Typogra scribitur  
an. 3. pro. 7. nam  
proxime praece-  
dens annus apud cū  
reae numeratur  
an. 6. post. *Coff.*  
Baf. neque ullum  
annum omitti ab  
eo certum est.  
a Vict. loc. citat.  
b 72 a sacra impe-  
ratoris ad Iobā  
datae st an. Iust.  
u. 4. post. *Coff.* Baf. a  
9. extat in Cōc. 5  
Col. 6. pa. 553. a.  
c Facta est sug-  
gestio ad sanct. pa-  
pam Vigiliū ab  
eisdem episcopis  
(Concil. Mop-  
vesteni.) Conc.  
5. coll. 5. pa. 557.  
d Acta in Con-  
cilio Mopvesteno  
ad Vigiliū Iu-  
stiniani Concilio  
& opera missa  
fuere ne in futu-  
ra generali Sy-  
nodo Theodorum  
ipse damnare ali-  
quo modo detrec-  
taret. Bar. anno.  
550. nu. 39.  
e Zoilum Impe-  
rator deposuit.  
Liber. ca. 23.  
f Firmus donis  
principis corrup-  
tus; damnationi  
3. Capitulorum  
assensu praeiuit.  
Vict. an. 11 (cor-  
rupte scribitur  
12) post. *Coff.* Baf.

to condemne the Chapters, but *Primasius*, *Verecundus*, and *Macarius* for not consenting, were all banished. So cleare and undoubted it is that the Emperor continued so constant in his condemning of these Chapters, that for every yeare since the Decree of Silence is supposed to be made, he was resolute in this cause, condemning and banishing such as consented not to the condemning of them.

13. Whence the shamelesse untruths of the Baronian narration is demonstrated. He tells you, and tells it with a *Constat*, that in the next yeare before the fift Councell, the Emperour recalled his Edi&th, and abrogated what he had done in this cause of the 3. Chapters, whereas not onely the whole generall Councell testifieth on the contrary, that hee still persisted constant in condemning of them, but *Victor* (one who had good reason to know these matters, as feeling the smart of the Emperours severity for his obstinacie in defending those Chapters) particularly witnesseth of that very yeare, that the Emperor was so eager in maintaining his Edi&th, and condemning the Chapters, that he both drew *Firmus*, the Primate of *Numidia* to his opinio, and banished *Macarius* Patriarch of *Iernusalem*, *Verecundus* Bishop of *Nica*, and *Primasius* another Bishop, because they would not consent to his Edi&th, and condemne the same Chapters. And what a brainlesse devise was this, that the Emperor in his 25. yeare should hang out his Edi&th, at Constantinople, so the Cardinall f fableth, as a matter of some great noveltie, to bee published to the Citie, whereas his Edi&th foure or five yeares before, was so divulged throughout the whole Church, that none may be thought to have beene ignorant thereof, seeing *universus & orbis Catholicus*, the whole Catholike Church was divided and rent into a schisme about that Edi&th, the one halfe defending, the other oppugning the same? Or what reason can the fabler give, why *Vigilius* should in the 25. yeare quarrell with the Emperor, rather then in the 24. 23. 22. in every one of which, *Iustinian* was the same man, constant in maintaining the truth published by his Edi&th? Did the hanging out of the Edi&th, more provoke the Popes zeale then the banishing, imprisoning of those who withstood the Edi&th? more then the Emperours enforcing, and compelling, *omnes antistites*, all the Bishops to condemne the *Three Chapters*? But enough of *Iustinian*, to manifest that he never observed this fictitious Decree of *Taciturnitie*.

14. After the Emperor and Pope, let us see if Catholikes, that is, those who condemned the three Chapters, did observe this Decree. They did not: but like the Emperour, they constantly continued to speake, to write against them as well after as before the time of this supposed Decree, it stopt not the mouth of any one of them; Not of *Menas*, not of *Theodorus*<sup>h</sup>, whom<sup>i</sup> for talking so much against those Chapters *Vigilius* suspended, and excommunicated, as the Baronian narration tells you, not of the other Bishops, subject to the, for *Vigilius* used the very same censure against them also, for their condemning of those Chapters, *We*, saith<sup>k</sup> *Vigilius*, *condemne thee O Menas*, with all the Bishops pertaining to thy Diocesse, yea, *we* condemne also thy fellow Eastern Bishops though of diverse provinces, be they of great

<sup>f</sup> *Iustinianus*  
Imp. contra tria  
Capitula publice  
(Constantinopoli)  
appendi iussit  
edictum. Bar. an.  
551. (quiesc. 10.  
post Coll. Basil.)  
nu. 2.

<sup>g</sup> Bin. not. in  
Conc. 3. S. Conci-  
lium. Ch. Bar. an.  
547. nu. 29.

<sup>h</sup> Bar. an. 551.  
nu. 5. *Theodorus*  
adversus tria ca-  
pitula publica  
publice agere non  
desistit.  
<sup>i</sup> Excommuni-  
catus referitur a  
Bar. an. 551. nu.  
11. 12.  
<sup>k</sup> *Ibid.* nu. 12.



or lesser Cities, wee condemne and excommunicate them all. Neither did they begin to condemne the Chapters, in that 25. yeare, wherein this sentence, by the account of *Baronius* was pronounced, but they did this ever since the time, that the Decree of Silence is supposed to bee made; for *Vigilius* there saith<sup>1</sup> to *Theodorus*, wee have declared *pene hoc quinquennio elapso*, almost these five yeares last past, our longanimitie and patience both towards you, and towards those who have beene seduced by you; which five yeares being reckned backe, will fall out in the 21. yeare of *Iustinian*, even from that yeare (and then was the decree of Silence said to bee published) did the Eastern Bishops continue to speake against, and condemne the *three Chapters*. Now although this against *Baronius*, who applaudes that sentence and writing of *Vigilius*, bee sufficient, yet because it is onely *argumentum ad hominem*, I will adde a more weightie testimonie to cleare this matter, concerning Catholikes, & that is, of the whole fift generall Councell, which saith<sup>m</sup>, the Emperour dorth manifest *quod nec quinquam latuit*, that whereof no man is ignorant, that the impietie of these Chapters, *ab initio aliena est à sancta Dei ecclesia*, is strange, and hath beene disliked by the holy Church, ever since the controversie about them hath beene moved. Then certainly no Catholike, none Catholikelie affected at any time forbore to condemne them, not one of them observed that Decree of Silence.

15. All the Cardinalls hope is now in the Defenders of these Chapters; they no doubt would bee willing to obey this Pontificall and Synodall Decree; seeing for the most part, they were *Africane, Illyrian*, & Western Bishops. Among them, if any where, the Pope might hope to have his Decree observed. They observe it? They are silent in this cause; Nay you shall see them, after the time that this Decree is supposed to be made, to be farre more eager in defending the *Three Chapters*, then ever they were before. For now, besides the defending of those Chapters, they boldly and bitterly invaighed against *Vigilius* himselfe, because he condemned the same. This<sup>n</sup> did *Liberatus* at *Carthage*, at *Tumen Victor*, at *Constantinople Facundus*, the Popes owne orator, (who now having turnd his stile, whetted it as sharpe against the Pope, as before he had done at the Popes command against the Emperour) yea the Popes owne Romane Deacons, *Rusticus* and *Sebastianus*, besides others, freely, and openly declamed<sup>o</sup> against the Pope, as one, who by condemning the 3. Chapters, did condemne the Councell of *Chalcedon*: nay, they proceeded even to flout and taunt the Pope, for his condemning of those Chapters; deriding his sentence against *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia* being dead, in this manner<sup>p</sup>, the Pope should have condemned not onely the person, and writings of *Theodorus*, *sed & territorium ipsum ubi positus est*; but even the very ground also where hee was buried, adding, that if any could finde but the bones of *Theodorus*, (though now accursed by the Pope) *gratanter acciperent*, they would very lovingly embrace them and keepe them for holy relickes.

16. And what speake I of a few particular men? In the 23. yeare of *Iustinian*, that is, in the second yeare after the supposed Decree, the *Illyrian*

1 *Ibid.* nu. 7.

in *Com. 5. Coll. 9*  
in *fine*.

n *Bar. ann. 548.*  
nu. 6. Non tantū  
*Rusticus* acuit  
stilum contra *Vigiliū*, sed alij  
plures, *Liberatus*,  
*Victor*, &c.  
o *Vbiq; vul-*  
*garunt ipsum*  
*Vigiliū* tria  
damnando capi-  
tula impugnare  
concilium *Chalc.*  
*Bar. an. 550.* nu.  
i.  
p *Vigiliū* in sua  
sententia, seu E-  
pistola *Rustico* et  
*Sebastiano* in  
*Com. 5. Coll. 7.*  
pa. 576. b.

y *Vid. Tun. an.*  
3. *post Conf. Bas.*  
sed corrupte le-  
gitur 9.  
z *Vid. Tun. an.*  
9 *post Conf. Bas.*

a *Bar. an. 548.*  
nu. 6.  
b *Qui postea*  
*(post ultimum*  
*judicium Pape)*  
*ab his dissensit,*  
*Schismatici ha-*  
*bui sunt. Cum*  
*tamen interea*  
*vide novissimum*  
*Apostolica sedis*  
*assensum, non*  
*esset piaculum*  
*pro tribus pug-*  
*nare capitulis.*  
*Bar. an. 546.*  
nu. 38.

Illyrian<sup>y</sup> Bishops held a Synod, by which was both writ a booke in defence of those Chapters, and sent unto the Emperour, and *Benenatus* Bishop of *Iustineanea*, was condemned by the same Synod, because hee spake against those Chapters. The next yeare<sup>z</sup> after that, did the Africane Bishops hold a Synod; wherein they did *nominatim*, and expressly condemne Pope *Vigilius*, excommunicate him, and shut him out of their communion, because he was one of those who condemned the *Three Chapters*, as *Victor* Bishop of *Tunec*, who as it seemes was present in that Synod, doth testifie: Now seeing the Cardinall professeth<sup>a</sup> that these divisions, and contentions were among Catholikes, *pugnantibus inter se orthodoxis, orthodoxall Bishops and Catholikes they were, who at this time fought one against another*, yea and by his position, Schismaticall they were not, because<sup>b</sup> the Pope had not yet given his last sentence. If one listed to digresse, here were a fit occasion to make a little sport with his Cardinallship, upon whose assertion it clearely ensueth, that a Synod, even an Africane Synod (which with them is more) yea the whole Church of Africke, may (and *de facto* hath so done) judge, censure, excommunicate and exclude from their communion the Pope, and yet for all this, themselves at the same time may be, and have *de facto* bene very good Catholikes, and neither heretickes, nor schismatickes. But of that point I have before intreated. This onely I doe now observe, that by the view and consideration of all sorts, and degrees of men in the Church, none at all observed that decree of Silence, in this cause, nor the Pope, nor the Emperour, nor the Orthodoxall professors, & such as before condemned the Chapters, nor the hereticall defenders of them: All these (and in one of these rankes, were comprehended all Christians at that time) by their speeches, by their writings, by their actions, by their Synodall decrees and judgements, doe evidently witness that there was no such decree of Silence ever made, which without all question amongst some one order and degree or other, would have been observed, and taken effect.

e *De hoc Vigily*  
*decreto (pro Si-*  
*lento) et mira est*  
*Theodori &*  
*dicina transac-*  
*tione testes sunt*  
*acta publica.*  
*Bar. an. 547. nu.*  
*42. Ista Acta ubi*  
*est, Constitutum*  
*Vigily de Ana-*  
*themate. an. 551.*  
nu. 12.  
d *Exstat tum a-*  
*pu'd Bar. an. 551*  
*nu. 6. et seq. tum*  
*apud Bie. post E-*  
*pist. 16. Vigily*  
e *Ibid. nu. 3.*  
pene hoc quin-  
quennio.  
f *ib. nu. 11. et 12*

17. To these I will adde one other reason, taken from the weaknesse, and unsoundnesse of that ground whereon the Cardinall hath framed this whole narration. He tells<sup>e</sup> us that this Decree of Silence, the Synod wherein it was made, and divers of the consequents (for some are of the Cardinalls owne invention) are testified by certaine publike acts or Records, to wit, those which contained the sentence and Pontificall Constitution<sup>d</sup> of Pope *Vigilius* against *Menas*, *Theodorus*, and the rest. In those acts indeed a good part of this Baronian fable is related, how *Menas*, *Dacius*, and many other both Greeke and Latine Bishops were present in this Synod, at the making of this Decree: how *Theodorus*,<sup>e</sup> and other Eastern Bishops had dealt for the space of five yeares against that Decree: how the Pope<sup>f</sup> after five yeares toleration and longanimitie, called an other Synod, and therein pronounced a sentence of Excommunication against *Theodorus*, *Menas*, and the rest, till they should acknowledge their fault, and make a satisfaction for the same. These and some other particulars are there expressed. Now if we can demonstrate these publike Acts

of *Baronius* to bee no other than forgeries, I thinke none will make doubt, but that all the rest of the Baronian narration which relies hereon, is a very fiction.

18. But can those publike Acts be convinced for such? they may; and that most evidently, besides many other meanes, by comparing the date of this sentence against *Mennas*, with the time of the death of *Mennas*. These Acts, Records, Sentence, or Constitution against *Mennas* (call them what you list) were made in the 25 yeares of *Iustinian*, for so in the dates of them is expressed; nor can it bee supposed that there is any error either in the writer or Printer; for both the Consular yeare is also added<sup>a</sup>, to wit, the tenth after the Cons. of *Basilus*; which answereth to the 25 of *Iustinian*, and the Pope accounts there almost five<sup>i</sup> yeares, since the Decree of Silence was made; which being placed by *Baronius*<sup>k</sup> in the 21, the fift current yeare after it, will directly fall to be the 25 yeare. So in the 25 of *Iustinian* did the Pope excommunicate *Mennas*; yea, write and send this Excommunication unto him, saying unto him in this<sup>l</sup> manner, *Teg. Mennam tandem a sacra communione suspendimus; we suspend thee O Mennas*, and all the other Bishops in thy Diocesse, so long untill every one of you acknowledging his error shall make competent satisfaction for his owne fault, which satisfaction, and submission to have beene performed by *Mennas* in the next yeare, to wit, the 26 of *Iustinian*. *Baronius*<sup>m</sup> with great pompe declareth. Now *Mennas* dyed five yeares before he offered this booke of supplication; or submitted himself to *Vigilius*; & 4. before the Pope sent out this Excommunication unto him, with that admonition to submit himselfe; for it is certainly testified by the Popes Legates in the first generall Councell, that *Mennas* dyed in the 21 yeare of *Iustinian*. In that Councell<sup>n</sup> a sermon or speech going under the name of *Mennas*, to *Vigilius*, was produced as a part of the Acts of the first Councell, the Legates of Pope *Agatho* cryed out before the Emperour and the whole Councell; that it was a forgery: which they proved<sup>o</sup>, and that most manifestly, because *Mennas* dyed in the 21 yeare of *Iustinian*, but the first Synod was congregated in the 26 yeare, which ended on the first of *Aprill*, though the first Session of the Synod was not held till the *May* next after, which was in the 27 yeare of *Iustinian*. Thus testified the Popes owne Legates; and the Emperour, with the whole Synod, upon their evidence, rejected their writing for a forgery.

19. Said I not truly unto you, that the Baronian narration was a peece of rare Poetry? might not a meane Poet make an excellent Tragedy of it? were it not a fine Pageant, to see the Pope, and so many Bishops sit in *Tropia*, and there make a law for *Taciturnity*, the Emperour, the Senate, and people consenting unto it? would it not bee another, and farre more delightfull Act, to see the Pope and Emperour quarrelling about this law, the one beating, buffeting, and persecuting, the other fleeing both by Sea and land, from *Placidiana* to *Saint Peter*, from him to *Euphemia*, from *Constantinople* to *Chalcedon*? what a sport were it to see the *Romane Apollo* ascend into his *Delphic* throne; and thence, as from *Olympus*, cast his *serie darts*, his thun-

g Data 19. Kel. Septemb. Imperante Domino Iustiniano an. 25. post. Conf. Basilij anno decimo. Bar. an. 551. nu. 12.

h Ibid.

i Pene hoc quinquennio elapsa monstravimus.

Ibid. nu. 7.

k Bar. an. 547. (qui est Iustinianus. 21. 22.) nu. 41. et 43.

l Apud Bar. an. 551. nu. 12.

m Bar. an. 552. nu. ad. Iose.

n Mennas libellum supplicum Vigilio obtulit.

n Conc. 6. Act. 3.

o Ex argumentis manifestissime comprobatur, quod Mennas sex annis ante quintam Synodum sub Vigilio celebratam ex hac vita migrasset. Bin. not. in Conc. 6. in Act. 3.



ders and lightnings against that *Typhoean* generation, which durst speake when he enjoyned silence? Now the embassage which the Emperour sent to *Chalcedon* to intreat his Holinesse to returne, the magnanimity of the Pope in refusing to come from the Altar, the Emperours yeelding to all that he prescribed; this of it selfe would in courage a Poet, and cause him to presume of an applause: But the most rare Pageant of all would bee, to see and heare *Mennas*, foure yeares after he was dead and rotten, to speake and dispute against the Decree of Silence (the *Silentes umbra*, to declame against Silence) to see him a Bishop, a Patriarch, at the voyce of the Popes sentence; *Audite hac Amphiarai sub terram abdita*; to come *ab inferis*, to come with a Bill of supplication in his hand, with a song of *Miserere* in his mouth, to the *Romane Iove*, and intreat pardon for his talking so much in the grave, and among the infernall ghosts, against the Popes Decree of Silence; & after all this to see the Pope shake hands with him, and all his Metropolitans, and Micropolitans, (note the eloquence of the Pope), and so, after a most joyfull reconciliation, to see the holy Reliques caried in a golden Chariot (an excellent dumbe shew) about the City, and that by a dead man; Can you doe lesse than give the Poet *Baronius* a Plaudite for his so rare invention, or contriving of this Fable?

20. Why, but is it credible that Cardinall *Baronius*, the great Annalist of our age, hee who bestowed thirty yeares in the study of these Ecclesiasticall affaires, that hee should so foully be overseene in a computation so easie, and so obvious, as to thinke *Mennas* to bee excommunicated, to come with a supplication to the Pope, and to ride in a triumphant Chariot, with those holy reliques, foure or five yeares after he was dead and rotten? Overseene? nothing lesse: It was no ignorance, no oversight in him; he knew all this matter *ad unguem*, hee knew that *Mennas* was dead long before that submission, and triumph: But the Cardinall was disposed, either to recreate the reader with the contemplation of this his Poetical fiction, or else for to shew you, that, with the charme of those forgeries, and counterfeit writings, with which he hath stuffed his Annals, hee is able to metamorphose all other men into very blocks and beetles, that they shall applaud his most absurd dotages as undoubted and historicall truths; which, that every man may perceive, it must be observed, that though in this place, where the cause betwixt *Vigilius* and the Emperour, is debated, the Cardinall is content that you should thinke *Mennas* to have been alive in the 26. year of *Iustinian*, that is, five yeares after he was dead, for otherwise all his narration, even the whole play had been spoiled, there had neither beene any Decree of Silence, nor any persecution by *Iustinian*, nor any flight of *Vigilius*, nor any excommunication of *Mennas* or *Theodorus*, nor any submission of them, and of the Emperour also to the Pope, the Pope had not beene knowne to bee so farre above Bishops, Patriarchs, and Emperours, that they must all stoope to him, and, laying their necks at his feet, say unto him, *Calcate me salem insipidum*, punish me as you please for speaking without your Holinesse leave and licence, yea, that Kings must pull downe, abrogate, and

p Tacum omni-  
bus Metropoli-  
tanic et Micro-  
politans Episco-  
pis. Vigil. senten-  
tia apud Bar.  
an. 551. nu. 12.

q Hoc opus ante  
annos circiter  
30 aggressus  
sum. Bar. in  
profa. dedic. an-  
te tom. 1. Anna-  
lium.

r Hoc anno (26.  
Iustiniani) finem  
vivendi fecit  
Mennas. Bar.  
an. 552. nu. 21.

and annull their imperiall Edicts, if the Pope doe but becke unto them; though, for these considerations, hee is here willing that you beleve that untruth concerning *Mennas*, for all these depend on that one sentence of *Andronicus* against *Mennas*, yet, when this matter is over-past, when the Cardinall comes to a new argument, where hee hopes, this, which is said about the cause of *Figilius*, will be forgotten, there he confesseth the truth indeed concerning *Mennas*, and tels you a quite contrary tale: For intreating of the Acts of the first Council, & particularly of that reason of the Popes Legat against the forged Epistle in *Mennas* name, he thus saith, *Ejusque in eodem libro attestat argumentum, quod Mennas diem obiit anno 21 Justiniani Imperatoris: The Legatus give a certain proofe, that the writing was forged, because Mennas dyed in the 21 yeare of Justinian the Emperour*. Loe, the Cardinall knew, and professeth it to bee, not onely true, but certaine, that *Mennas* dyed in the 21 yeare of *Justinian*, and yet against his owne certain knowledge, for maintaining this fictitious Decree of Silence, and the fables thereon depending, he perswades you to beleve that *Andronicus* dealt against this Decree, was excommunicated by *Figilius*, and submitted himselfe to the Pope, and rode with the relikes five yeares after he was dead.

21. Truly this was scarce faire and honest dealing in the Cardinall, by untruths to strive to bolster out forged Acts and writing: But the Cardinals Annals are so full of such like stuffe, that, if you divide them into foure parts, I doe constantly affirme there is no more truth in three of those foure, than you have seene to bee in this fable, which from a most base forgery, knowne also to the Cardinall for such, hee hath commended for a grave and authentike history unto us: And I should grow somewhat out of patience to see the Cardinall so grossly contradict, both the truth, and his owne writings also, but that, by my long and serious tossing of his bookes, I perceive this is so familiar a trick with him, that, for the usuall meeting of it, I have long since forgotten to be angry with him for such petty faults. This I hope, which hath bene declared, will serve for a caveat unto all, to take heed how they credit any matter whatsoever upon the Cardinals relation: either it is in it selfe untrue, or it springs from some untruth, or by his purpose in relating it, it is made to serve but for a pully to draw you into some untruth, *aut aliquis latet dolus*, either in the head or tale there is a sting, beleve him not. And I would also have added somewhat for *Binius*, who in this, as in other fancies and fables, applauds *Baronius*, but I suppose, that as hee sucketh his errors from *Baronius*, so hee will thinke, that the refuting of *Baronius* is a sufficient warning for him to purge his Edition of the Councils from such vile and shamelesse untruths. Thus much of that former point which concernes the second Period in *Figilius* changings.

## CAP. XVII.

That Vigilius; neither by his Pontificall Decree, nor so much as by a perfonall profession consented to, or confirmed the first Council, after the end thereof, or after his supposed exile.



THE other point proposed concerns that fourth and last change of Vigilius judgement, whereby, as Baronius tells us, he, by his Apostolicall Decree confirmed the first Council, when, about a yeare after the end thereof, he returned out of exile. That such a change of Vigilius can no way helpe Baronius, or his cause, though it should be granted unto him, we have before declared, but because at which we then said was onely spoken upon a supposall and admission of this Baronian change, we will now more nearly examine the whole matter, and try whether there was indeed any such Decree ever made by Vigilius, and whether he did at any time after the end of the first Council change his judgement, in such sort, that he became a condemner of the Three Chapters, and an approver of the first Synod. And truly I could wish so much good to Vigilius, as that there might appeare some cleare, and ancient records, to testifie his renouncing of heresie, and condemning of his owne hereticall and Ambrosiall decree, published in the time of the Council, for defence of the Three Chapters: But the truth is more precious unto me than the love of Vigilius or any Pope whatsoever; & because it is the truth alone which causeth me to discusse this point, I must needs confesse, that I can finde nothing at all, which can effectually induce mee to beleeye it, but there are many and pregnant reasons which inforce me to thinke, that Vigilius never made any such Decree or Change, as Baronius fancieth, but that this whole fourth Period and change of Vigilius, so gloriously painted out by Baronius, is nothing else but another fiction, and peece of the Cardinals owne Poetry, which, without all warrant or ground from any ancient writer, hee, like a Spider, onely out of his owne braine hath woven and devised.

That Vigilius made no such Decree, the reason which Baronius gives in this very case, may declare he, to prove that Vigilius made not this decree, either during the time of the Synod, or shortly after the end thereof, hath these words: *Si Vigilius had then assented by his letters, nique littera illa Ab eis fuisset intertextae*; verily those letters, purchased with so great labour, would have bene inserted among the Acts of the first Synod, and a great number of copies would have been taken thereof, spread abroad, and made knowne to all Churches, as well in the East, as West, (even as the Epistle of LEO was) because by those letters, *validarentur quae à Synodo sancitae*; those things which the first Synod had decreed, the Pope contradicting them, and thereby they being invalid, should now be made of force, the Pope consenting to them. Thus Baronius. Doth not the same reason as effectually prove, that

in eam vero Vigilius graviter damnatus inter ipsum Orientem ab Ecclesia Rom. divisum cerneret, nisi Synodus quinta consentiret, eam probavit. Bar. an. 553. nu. 235.  
 b Vigilius abrogato quod pro 3. Capitalis ediderat Constantino, quinta Synodo adversanti, eandem Synodum auctoritate Apostolica comprobavit. Bar. 554. nu. 7. Vigilius hanc Synodum quintam, suo Decreto, suaeque auctoritate Pontificia confirmavit. Bin. not. in Conc. 5. § Praefatus; et Decretum Vigilius vocat. Bar. an. 553. nu. 231.  
 c Quo anno (554.) Vigilius praedictus Narfensis liberatur exilio. Bar. an. 554. nu. 1. necesse est dicere id à Vigilio factum (id est quintam Synodum) hoc tempore (anno 54. Jacum abbas. folius est. Bar. an. 554. Idem ait Bin. not. in Conc. 5. § Praefatus. d Sup. ca. 25. e Bar. an. 553. nu. 223.



that he made no such decree at al, or not a yeare after, as that he made it not within one or two moneths after the end of the Synod? with what labour, at what price would not the Bishops of the fift Synod have purchased that decree? how gladly would they have annexed it to their Acts, as the Decree of *Leo* is to the acts at *Chalcedon*? How many copies and extracts would they have taken of it, and dispersed them every where, both in the West and East, to testifie the truth of their Synodall judgement, and that the infallible Iudge had consented to their sentence, and confirmed the same. Or would they have done this within a month, and not a yeare after the end of the Synod? what odds to the point in hand can that small difference of time make in the cause? specially considering that the very Epistle of *Leo*, whereof the Cardinall speaketh, was not written till five & moneths after the end of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, and yet was it annexed to the acts thereof. If then the Cardinalls reason bee of force to prove that hee writ not this Decree shortly after the Synod, it is altogether as effectual to prove he writ it not at all, nor after his returne about a yeare after out of exile.

3. The Cardinall gives yet another evidence hereof, *Pelagius*, saith he<sup>h</sup>, the successor of *Vigilius* did thinke it fit, that the fift Synod should bee approved, and the three Chapters condemned, moved especially hereunto by this reason, that the Easterne Church, ob *Vigili* constitutum schismate scissa, being rent and divided from the Romane by reason of the Constitution of *Vigilius*, might be united unto it. How was the Easterne Church divided from the Romane in the time of *Pelagius*, by reason of that decree of *Vigilius* in defence of the Three Chapters, if *Vigilius* by another decree published after it had recalled, and adnulled it? If the Popes condemning of those Chapters, and approving of the fift Councell could unite the Churches, then the decree of *Vigilius* (had there beene any such) would have effected that union. If the Apostolike Decree of *Vigilius* could not effect it, in vaine it was for *Pelagius* to thinke by his approbation, which could have no more authority then Apostolike call, to effect that union. If the cause of the breach and disunion of those Churches was, as *Baronius* truly saith, the Constitution of *Vigilius* in defence of the Three Chapters, against the judgement of the fift Synod, seeing it is cleare by the Cardinalls owne confession, that the disunion continued till after the death of *Vigilius*, it certainly hence followeth, that the Constitution of *Vigilius*, which was the cause of that breach, was never by himselfe repealed, which even in *Pelagius* time remained in force, and was then a wall of separation of the Easterne, from the Westerne Church. Again, if the Popes approving the fift Councell, and condemning the three Chapters was, as in truth it was, and as the Cardinall noteth<sup>i</sup> it to have beene, the cause to unite those Churches, seeing by his owne confession in *Vigilius* time they were not united (for *Pelagius*<sup>k</sup> after *Vigilius* his death, sought to take away that schisme) it certainly hence followeth, that *Vigilius* never by any Decree approved that Synod, and their Synodall condemning of those Chapters: for had he so done, the union had in his time presently beene effected.

*Epist. Epist. Leonis 61. quae incipit, Omnem fraternitatem, g. Conc. Chalcedonensis 28. Off. Coll. Martiano, aut 1. Novemb. ut patet ex ult. Sess. Epistola vero Leonis scripta est 21. Martij Coll. Opilione, ut patet ex fine Epist. h. Bar. an. 553. nu. 236.*

*i Cujus (Vigili) postremam sententiam (pro approbatione 5. Conc. & condemnatione triu Capitulorum) postea omnes sequuti, universa Dei Ecclesia paucis schismaticis exceptis, eandem Synodum ut oecumenicam semper novit. Bar. an. 554. nu. 7. k Bar. an. 553. nu. 236.*

4. The same may be perceived also by the Westerne Church. For as that *Pontificall decree of Vigilius* (had there beene any such) would have united the Easterne, so much more would it have drawne the Westerne, the Italian, and specially the Romane Church, to consent to the fift Councell, and condemning of the *three Chapters*: but that they persisted in the defence of the *three Chapters*, and that also to the very end of *Vigilius* his life, may divers wayes be made evident. While *Pelagius* being then but a Deacon was chosen Pope after the death of *Vigilius*, and was to be consecrated Bishop, there could no more then two Bishops be found in the Westerne Church that would consecrate or ordaine him Bishop: wherefore contrary to that Canon both of the Apostles<sup>m</sup> and Nicene Fathers<sup>n</sup>, requiring three<sup>o</sup> Bishops to the consecration of a Bishop (which they so often boast<sup>p</sup> of in their disputes against us) the Pope himselfe was faine to be ordained onely by two Bishops, with a Presbyter of *Ostia* in stead of the third. *Anastasi- us* very ignorantly, (if not worse) sets downe the reason thereof to have beene, for that *Pelagius* was suspected to have beene guilty (by poison or some other way) of the death of *Vigilius*. A very idle fancie, as is the most in *Anastasi- us*; for *Pelagius* was in banishment long before the death of *Vigilius*, and there continued till *Vigilius* was dead, he had little leisure nor oportunitie to thinke of poisoning or murdering his owne Bishop, by whose death he could expect no gaine. The true cause why the Westerne Bishops distasted *Pelagius*, is noted by *Victor* who then lived. Hee<sup>t</sup> before hee came from *Constanti- nople* consented to the fift Synod, and condemned the *Three Chapters*. Now the Westerne<sup>r</sup> Bishops so detested the fift Synod, and those who with it condemned those Chapters, that among them all there could be found but two Bishops who held with the Synod, and so allowed of *Pelagius* and his act in consenting thereunto, and those two with the Presbyter of *Ostia*, were the ordainers of *Pelagius*, whom *Victor* in his corrupted language calls prevaricators. Let any man now confider with himselfe, whether it bee credible that in all *Italy*, and some Provinces adjoyning, there should be but two Bishops who would consent to the *Apostolicall decree of Vigilius*, for approving the fift Councell, if he had indeed published such a decree. If they knew not the Popes sentence in this cause (which they held, and that rightly, for a cause of faith) to be *infallible*, how was not the westerne or the Romane Church hereticall at this time, not knowing that point of faith, which is the transcendent principle and foundation of all doctrines of faith? If they knew it to bee *infallible*, seeing his judgement must then over- sway their owne, how could there bee no more but two bishops found among them all, who approved the Popes Cathedrall sentence, and consented to his *infallible* judgement? Seeing then it is certaine that the Westerne Church did generally reject the fift Synod, after the death of *Vigilius*, and seeing it is not to bee thought

1 Dum non ef-  
fent Episcopi qui  
eum ordinarunt,  
inventi sunt duo,  
Iohannes,  
& Bonus, &  
Andreas Presby-  
ter de Ostia, &  
ordinaverunt  
eum Episcopum,  
Anast. in vita  
Pelag. 1.  
m Can. Apost. 1  
n Conc. Nic.  
Can. 4.  
o Certe omnino-  
do 3 Episcopi  
debent esse con-  
gregati, &  
ita faciant ordi-  
nationem. Can.  
4. Conc. Nic.  
p Bell. lib. de  
Notis Ecclesie,  
ca. 8. §. Ex quo.  
Et Bin. in Notis  
ad Can. 1. Apost.  
aliqui  
q Subdixerunt  
se à communione  
ejus, dicentes,  
quia in morte  
Vigilij se mis-  
cui. Anast. in  
vita Pelag. 1.  
r Nam Vigilius  
obijt anno pra-  
ecedente quom  
Pelagius de  
exilio revocatus  
est. Vist. Tug.  
in Chron. ad an.  
16. (corrupte  
legitur 17.)  
Basilij, et ad  
an. sequentem.  
s Pelagius con-  
demnatus ea  
(tria Capitula)  
que dudum con-  
stantissime de-  
fendebat, à pra-  
varicatoribus ordinatus est. Vist. ad an. 17. (corrupte legitur 18.) post Conf. Basilij.  
Anastasi- us occidentales fere omnes, aliam post 4. admittere Oecumenicam Synodum, ac non pariter Pelagium repertum Episcopum  
pro Romae, à quibus consecraretur. Bar. an. 556. nu. 1.

that they would have persisted in such a generall dislike thereof had they knowne *Vigilius* to have by his *Apostolicall* sentence decreed, that all should approve the same, of which his sentence (had there been any such) they could not have beene ignorant (for if by no other meanes, which were very many, *Pelagius* himselfe would have brought and assuredly made knowne the same unto them) this their generall rejection of the first Synod, is an evident prooffe that this Baronian decree which hee ascribeth to *Vigilius* is no better then the former of silence, both untrue, both fictitious, and of the two, this the far worse; seeing for this the Cardinall hath not so much as any one, no not a forged writing, on which he may ground it, it is wholly devised by himselfe, he the onely Poet or maker of this fable.

5. To this may be added that which is mentioned in *Bede* concerning the Councell of *Aquileia* in *Italy*. That Councell was held neare about, or rather, as by *Signonius* narration it appeareth, after the death of *Vigilius*; and in it were present *Honoratus* Bishop of *Millan*, *Macedonius* B. of *Aquileia*, *Maximianus* B. of *Ravenna*, besides many other Bishops of *Liguria*, *Venice* and *Istria*. These being as *Bede* saith, unskillfull of the faith, doubted to approve the first Synod; nay, *Concilium illud non observandum esse statuere*, they decreed that the first Synod should not be allowed or received. What? would so many Italian Bishops in an Italian Councell decree the quite contradictory to the Popes known judicial sentence in a cause of faith? the Pope decreed (as *Baronius* saith) that the first Councell ought to be imbraced. The Italian Synod decreeth that the first Councell ought to be rejected. Neither onely did they thus decree, but as *Bede* noteth, they continued in this opinion, *donec salutaribus beati Pelagii monitis instructa consensit*, untill being instructed by the wholesome admonitions of Pope *Pelagius*, they consented to the first Councell, as other Churches did. Now this *Pelagius* of whom *Bede* speaketh, was *Pelagius* the second, who was not Pope till more then 20. yeares after the death of *Vigilius*. He to reclame those Bishops of *Istria*, *Venice*, and *Liguria*, writ a very large and decretall Epistle (which *Binius* compares to that of *Leo* to *Flavianus*) wherein he declares every one of those *Three Chapters*, to be repugnant to the faith and decrees of the ancient Councells. By this decretall instruction of *Pelagius* the second, were those Italian defenders of the *Three Chapters*, after twenty yeares, and more, reduced as *Bede* noteth, to the unity of the Church, and to approve of the first Councell. Had *Vigilius* made, as *Baronius* fancieth, the like decree, why tooke it not the like effect in those Western Bishop? was there more then *Apostolicall* authority and instruction in the decree of *Pelagius*? or was there lesse then that in the decree of *Vigilius*?

6. Nay there is another speciall point to be observed concerning that Epistle of *Pelagius*, *Elias* Bishop of *Aquileia*, and the rest who defended the *three Chapters*, among other reasons urged the authority of *Vigilius* on their part, thereby countenancing their error; in that they taught no other doctrine in defending those Chapters then the *Apostolicall* See had taught by *Vigilius*; thus writ they in their Apology which they sent to *Pelagius*, ayming no doubt at that *Apostolicall* Constitution of *Vigilius*.

usq. lib. de  
sex Aetate. am.  
no mundi, 46. 57.  
x. Signon. lib. 20.  
de Occid. Imper.  
an. 554. in fine.  
y. Ob imperitiam  
fidei s. concilii  
suscipere diffidit  
Synodus Aquileie.  
Bede. loc. cit.  
z. Signon. loc. cit.  
a. Bed. loc. cit.  
b. Apud Bedam  
legitur (beati  
Sergii) qui vixit  
annis 130. post  
Vigilium, eandem  
errorem sequitur.  
Platina, & alij.  
Sed legendum  
esse Pelagii non  
Sergii, constat ex  
Ivone, cuius  
verba ex decreto  
citatur Signonius,  
loco citato. &  
ibid. ex Beda legi-  
tur Pelagii.  
c. Vigilius obiit,  
an. 556. iuxta  
Baron. Pelagius  
autem 2. cepit  
an. 577. iuxta  
eundem Baron.  
d. Ex e. 7. Pe-  
lagii 2.  
e. Binius. Not. ad  
eam Epistolam  
Pelagii.  
f. Rursus per E-  
pistolam vestram  
dicitur. A sede  
Apostolica vos  
doctos & con-  
firmatos ne huius  
rei (i. Synodo  
quinta & con-  
demnationi tri-  
um Capitulorum)  
consentire de-  
beatis. Sedes  
Apostolica per  
Vigilium restitit.  
Pelag. Epist. 7.  
§. Rursus.



g Vigilius amplissimus scriptis contrariam sententiam (ei que in quinta Synodo definita est,) professus est, & ad eam festinandum universam ecclesiam catholicam impulsit. *Uas. an. 554. m. 6.*

h Cuius mutatio sententia hinc sed in crimine obicitur. *Pelag. Epist. 7. §. Dicit.*

i Latini homines & Graciani ignari dum linguam nesciunt, errorem tarde cognoverunt. *Pelag. ibid. §. Rursus.*

k Predecessorum nostrorum in hac causa consensus tanto post manus non fuit. *ibid.*

l Debet. An illud tanto post, referri potuit ad decretum Vigili editum anno proximo sequenti post Concilium si non potest.

published in the time of the Councell, whereby hee decreed that the *Three Chapters* ought by all to be defended: for that was it as the Cardinall & faith, which moved, may enforced all to follow that opinion, and to defend the *Three Chapters*. What doth *Pelagius* now answer to this reason? Truly had *Vigilius* made any such later Decree, as the Cardinall fancieth, by which he had approved the fifth Synod, and so both condemned the *three Chapters*, and repealed his owne former judgement in defence thereof, neither could *Pelagius* have beene ignorant of that decree, neither would he, being so earnestly pressed therewith, have omitted that opportunity, both to grace *Vigilius*, and most effectually confute that which was the speciall reason on which his op-  
posites did relye. Could he have truly replied, that *Vigilius* himselfe upon better advise had recalled his Decree made in defence of those Chapters, and by his last Apostolicall judgement condemned the same Chapters, this had cut insunder the very sinewes of that objection. But *Pelagius* returns them not this answer, but knowing that to bee true which they said of *Vigilius*, hee tells them (which is a point worthy observing) that the Apostolike See might change<sup>h</sup> their judgement in this cause (and this even by *Pelagius* himselfe is a cause of faith,) and that the ignorance of the Greeke<sup>i</sup> in the Westerne Bishops was the cause why they so lately consented to the fifth Synod. And so though *Vigilius* had judged that the *Three Chapters* ought to be defended, yet the successors of *Vigilius* might long after, as they did, teach, and himselfe define, that the same Chapters ought to be condemned, and that the fifth Councell wherein they were condemned, ought to be approved. A very strong inducement, that *Pelagius* knew not, and then that *Vigilius* made not any such Decree as the Cardinall commendeth unto us.

7. For any Apostolicall Decree then, whereby *Vigilius* after his exile recalled his former judgment, or approved the fifth Councell, there was none, as besides those reasons which the Cardinall himselfe giveth, the persisting of the Westerne Churches in defence of those Chapters, not onely after the death of *Vigilius*, but till the time of *Pelagius* the second, makes evident. If *Vigilius* at all consented to the Synod after the end thereof, it was onely by some private or personall, but not by any decretall or Pontificall approbation. And if the reasons or pretences of *Baronius* prove ought at all, this is the most that can be collected from them. And this though wee should grant and yeeld unto them, yet can it no way helpe their cause, or excuse the Popes Cathedrall judgment from being fallible, onely it would serve, to save *Vigilius* himselfe from dying an heretike, or under the *Anathema* of the holy Councell. For as they teach, and teach it with ostentation, as a matter of great wit and subtilty, that the Pope may erre personally, or in his owne person hold an heresie, which onely hurts himselfe, and not the Church, but erre doctrinally, or judicially define an heresie he cannot, even so (to pay them with their owne coine) might it fall out at this time with *Vigilius*; hee being wearied with long exile, might perhaps for his owne person condemne the *Three Chapters*, and approve the Synod, which may be called a personall truth, or a personal profession in the Pope, the benefit wherof

was onely to redound to himselfe, either to free him from the censure of the Synod, or procure the Emperors favour, & goodwill, that he might returne home to his See, but that this professing (supposing he made it) was *doctrinall* or *Cathedrall*, delivered *ex officio* by the Pope as Pope, so that by it he intended to bind the whole Church to doe the like, neither *Baronius*, nor any of all his favourers can ever prove. Now were I sure that the Cardinall, or his friends, would be content with this grant of a *personall* truth in Pope *Vigilius*, I could be willing to let it passe for currant without further examination. But alas, they are no men of such low thoughts and lookes, their eyes are ever upon the Supremacie and *Infallibilitie* of the Popes judgement: As *personall* errors hurt them not, so *personall* truths helpe them not, *Baronius* will either have this consent of *Vigilius* to bee *Indiciall*, *Doctrinall*, *Apostolicall*<sup>1</sup>, and *Cathedrall*, or he will have none at all. And therefore to demonstrate how farre *Vigilius* was frō decreeing this, I will now enter into a further discussion of this point then I first intended, not doubting to make it evident, that none of all the Cardinalls reasons are of force to prove so much as a private or *personall* consent in *Vigilius* to condemne the *Three Chapters*, and approve the fift Councell, after the end of the fift Synod, or after that exile which the Cardinall so often mentioneth.

8. The Cardinalls reasons to prove this, are three: The first is taken from the testimonie of *Evagrius*<sup>m</sup>, who then lived. *Nicephorus*, *Cedrenus*, *Zonaras*, *Photius*, and all Greeke writers, *Græci omnes affirmant*, they all testifie *Vigilius* to have assented to this fift Councell, and that by letters, or by a booke, whence the Cardinall collecteth, that seeing he consented not either during the time of the Synod, or shortly after, for he was sent into banishment, because he would not consent unto it, *necesse est affirmare* ° *id ab ipso factū esse hoc tempore, cum ab exilio solutus est, liberque dimissus*; It must of necessitie be affirmed, that he consented at that time when he was freed from exile, and dismissed home to Rome. Thus *Baronius*: whom I will never beleieve to have been so simple and ignorant, as that he knew not, how lame, defective, and unsound this his necessarie collection was. That his *Necesse est*, is meerly inconsequent, it is not so good as *Contingens est*. That *Vigilius* consented by a booke, or letters, to the Synod, is certaine, none that I know makes doubt of it, and that is all that *Evagrius*, or any of his other witnesses affirme: but neither *Evagrius*, nor any one of them saith, that *Vigilius* consented to the Synod after the end thereof, or after he was sent into banishment: this and this onely is it which wee deny, and which *Baronius* undertakes to prove: but when he comes to his prooffe, hee still, and that most fraudulently, omitteth this which is the principally say the onely verbe in the sentence. And to prove that *Vigilius* consented to the Synod in condemning the three Chapters, what needed the Cardinall to cite all, or any one of the Greeke writers? The very Acts of the fift Councell doe often and expressly testifie this, *Vigilius* hath often by writings, without writing condemned, and anathematized the *Three Chapters*. In the very Synodall sentence, it is said, It hath happened that *Vigilius*, living in this City, hath beene present

1 Ante novissimū  
Apostolicæ sedis  
assensum. Bar.  
an. 546. nu. 38.  
itidemq; ejus suc-  
cessoribus licuit,  
in ipsius Vigili  
abire Decretum.  
Bar. an. 553. nu.  
231. Quam  
Synodum Apo-  
stolica authorita-  
te comprobavit.  
an. 554. nu. 7.  
m Bar. an. 553.  
nu. 223.  
n Bar. an. 554.  
nu. 4.

olbid.

q Act. conc. 5.  
Coll. 1. pa. 320. a.  
& Coll. 7. pa.  
578. a.  
q Collat. 3. pa.  
584. a.

at those things which are noted concerning these Chapters, & *tam sine scriptis, quam in scriptis ea sapius condemnasse*, and to have condemned the same as well by writing as by word. The whole purpose of the seventh Collation is no other but to shew out of *Vigilius* own writings, that he consented with the Councell in condemning the three Chapters, the very letters of *Vigilius*, which were read in that seventh Collation, do clearly witness his consent and judgement in condemning those Chapters. The Councell condemnes them, *Vigilius* condemnes them, Doth not *Vigilius* consent to, and with the Synod? Did he not *per libellum, & literas*, expresse that assent, when his owne Epistles testifie that he condemned those Chapters, as did also the Synod: wherefore of his consent to the Synod there is no doubt. But this consent of his was before the time that the Councell made their Synodall Decree, yea before they assembled in the Synod, it was during the time of the second Period, before mentioned, shortly after his coming to *Constantinople*, untill the Councell met together, all that time he consented in judgement with the Councell, he condemned the Chapters, as the Councell did. But at the time of the Councell, when *Vigilius* should have consented also in making the Synodall Decree for condemning of those Chapters, then hee dissented from the Synod and published an *Apostolicall Constitution* in defence of the Three Chapters. So he both consented and that by letters, yea by his Decree, with the Synod, and withall he dissented, and that also by his Decree, from the Synod. His consent, which the Synodall Acts doe shew and testifie, *Evagrius* and the rest who saw and therein followed the Acts, report and that truly. His dissent, which his owne *Apostolicall Constitution* kept in their Vaticane doth shew and testifie, & which in likelihood *Evagrius* saw not, nor knew thereof, they report not, but they deny it not. But for that Baronian consent after the end of the Synod, or after his exile, of that in *Evagrius* and the rest there is no mention, nor any small signification.

*Evag. lib. 4. ca.*  
37.

9. It is the precedent consent of *Vigilius*, not that Baronian and subsequent consent, of which *Evagrius* and the rest intreat, which may appeare even by the very words of *Evagrius*. *Vigilius* *per literas consensit Concilio, non tamen interesse voluit*. He saith not, *Vigilius* would not be present at the Councell, but after the end of it hee consented by letters, unto it, (this is the false and corrupt glosse of *Baronius*) but *Vigilius* consented to the Councell by his letters, but would not be present. His consent by letters was the former, his deniall to come was the later. For when *Evagrius* saith, *consensit, sed noluit interesse*, he plainly sheweth that *Vigilius* might have beene present in the Councell, as well as have consented by his letters, he might, but he would not: now had his consent beene after his returne from exile, that is, an whole yeare after the end of the Councell, *Vigilius* could not possibly, though hee would never so gladly, have beene present in the Councell, nor would *Evagrius* have said, *consensit sed noluit interesse*, but hee should have said, *consensit sed non potuit interesse*, hee consented indeed with the Synod, but he could not be present in it, because when he consented, the Synod was dissolved, and ended a yeare before. The sense in *Nicephorus*

is



is the very same, but his words a little more cleare, *Vigilius*, saith he, *et si scripto interveniente cum Eutichio conveniret, assidere tamen illi noluit*, although he agreed with *Eutichius*, by a writing, (this as it seemes was his Epistle to *Rusticus* and *Sebastianus* read in the Synod) yet hee would not sit with him in the Councell. Importing hereby that *Vigilius* might also have sitten with *Eutichius*, when hee consented in doctrine with him, but he would not: which is evidently to bee understood of his precedent, not of any subsequent consent after the end of the Synod. The very same is the meaning of *Photius*, Though *Vigilius* was not forward to come to the sacred assembly, *communem tamen patrum fidem libello confirmavit*, yet he confirmed the same common faith, (marke, the same faith, so he accounts the cause of the Three Chapters to be a cause of faith, and the condemning of them to bee the confirming of the faith) by a booke, which booke is the same that *Evagrius* and *Nicephorus* meant, the booke, Epistle, or Constitution of *Vigilius*, made before the time of the Councell, and then read therein; but of any confirming that common faith by *Vigilius* after the end of the Synod, *Photius* hath not one syllable.

1 *Niceph. lib. 17. ca. 17.*

2 *Phot. lib. de 7. Synod. in Conc. 5*

10. Now whereas the Cardinall<sup>u</sup> adds, that *Graci omnes de consensione Vigiliij* affirmeth, that all Greeke writers affirm *Vigilius* to have consented to the Councell, it is nothing but an untrue, and vaine bragge of *Baronius* to downeface the truth, for *Zonaras* affirmes it not, nor *Cedrenus* (and yet both these are expressly named by the Cardinall to write this) nor *Glicias*, nor *Constantinus Manasses*, nor the Cardinalls owne *Theophanes*. And yet if we should admit them to say the like, or the same with *Evagrius*, *Nicephorus*, and *Photius*, that *Vigilius* did consent to the Synod by a booke or letters, yet what one of all the Greek writers, yea or Latine either, can the Cardinall produce to say that which he doth, that *Vigilius* after the end of the Synod, or after hee was sent into banishment, consented to the Synod? That by his precedent letters, and judicall sentence he consented to the same faith, which the Synod decreed, is true; this the Cardinall doth, but should not prove; but that by a subsequent consent or writing he approved the Synod after his owne exile, & his none of the Cardinals witnesses affirmeth, this the Cardinall should, but neither doth nor can prove.

u *Bar. an. 554. nu. 4.*

11. His second reason is taken from the fact of *Iustinian* in restoring *Vigilius*. The Emperor, saith he<sup>x</sup>, was most carefull for the condemning of the Three Chapters, and therefore punished severely such as withstood his Edict and the Decree of the Synod: how then could hee have endured *Vigilius* to have beene freed from exile, & to returne into the West, nisi consensisset, unlesse he had consented to the Synod? Seeing otherwise *Vigilius* would have stirred up all the Bishops in the West against the Emperors Edict, and the Synodall sentence. Now that the Emperor did free *Vigilius* from exile, and permit him to returne to the West, *Baronius*<sup>y</sup> proves that, by *Anastasius*<sup>z</sup>, out of whom hee relates, that the whole Romane Clergie entreated *Narces* that he would be a meane to the Emperor to restore unto the *Vigilius*, & the rest who were banished with him. The Emperor at the entreatie of *Narces* sent presently to *Gissa*, *Proconculus*, and other places, and called them to him who were banished, and

x *Bar. an. 554. nu. 6.*

y *An. eodem nu. 1. et an. 553. nu. 221. liquet ex Anastasio Vigilius fuisse in exilium deportatum, &c.*  
z *Anast. in vita Vigily.*

*a* Vultis habere  
Vigiliū, ut fuit,  
Papa vester? Mi-  
nusce? Hic habet  
is Pelagiū  
Archidiaconū  
&c. Anast. ibid.  
*b* Liqueat ex A-  
nastasio omnes  
ab exilio pariter  
revocatos. Bar.  
an. 553. nu. 222  
c. Alia nonnulla  
videm presenti ca-  
cessit, & ipso ex-  
igente sanctionū  
promulgavit.  
Bar. an. 554.  
nu. 6.  
d. Donis, muneribus,  
ac privilegijs  
ornatus in Italiā  
redire permissus  
fuit. Bin. notis in  
conc. 5. §. Pra-  
stitit.  
e Bar. an. 554.  
nu. 6.  
f. Quorum solū  
causā odium con-  
flatumerat, &  
exilium irroga-  
tum. Bar. ibid.

*g* Theod. biflor.  
lib. 2. ca. 17.

put it to their choice, whether <sup>a</sup> they would have Vigilius to be their Pope; or Pelagius there present among them: and when they desired, *Vigilius*, *dimisit omnes cum Vigilio*, he sent them all <sup>b</sup> home with *Vigilius*. Nay the Emperor did not onely restore him, and send him home, but granted <sup>c</sup> divers matters (gifts, rewards, and Priviledges, as *Binius* <sup>d</sup> calleth them) and at his entreatie published a pragmaticall sanction for the affaires of *Italie*; as the words of the sanction, *Pro petitione Vigilij*, doe declare. Hence now doth the Card: make his inference, that *absque dubio*, without all doubt *Vigilius* was very deare to the Emperor, seeing he granted such favours unto him, but there could have beene no friendship at all betwixt thē, unlesse *Vigilius* after his returne from exile, had consented to the Synod, and condemned the *Three Chapters*, seeing <sup>e</sup> his not consenting thereunto, was the cause of his banishment. Thus *Baronius*: who hath very handsomely concluded, that *absque dubio*, *Vigilius* after his returne out of exile, consented to the fift Councell. If now wee can clear this reason, wherein consists the whole pith of the Cardinals cause, I well hope that this consent of *Vigilius*, of which he so much boasteth, will be acknowledged to bee nothing else then a Baronian dreame.

12. And first admitting for a while the Cardinalls antecedent; the consequent sure is inconsequent. *Iustinian* might upon the entreatie of *Narses*, send *Vigilius* home, though *Vigilius* had not consented to the Synod after the end thereof. *Narses* was a man for his pietie, prudence, fortitude, & felicitie in warre, exceedingly beloved & honored by *Iustinian*. They who are conversant in histories, are not ignorant that Emperors doe yeeld many times greater matters then the restoring of *Vigilius*, at the entreatie of such as *Narses* was. When the *Romane Matrones* <sup>g</sup> (their husbands not daring to motion such a matter) entreated *Constantinus* to restore *Liberius* to his See, from which he was then banished, the Emperour, though he was most violently bent against *Liberius*, and had placed an other Bishop in his See, yet, as *Theodoret* writeth, *sic inflectebatur*, hee was so affected with their entreatie, that he yeelded to their request, thinking it fitter that there should be two Bishops at once in *Rome*, rather then he would seeme so obdurate and unkinde, as to deny that petition in the time of his triumph. It was as great incongruities and disproportion in the government of *Constantinus* an Arian, to restore *Liberius*, then a Catholike, as for *Iustinian* being a Catholike Emperor, to restore *Vigilius* being now an hereticall Bishop. The hatred of *Constantinus* to *Liberius* was farre greater, then *Iustinians* against *Vigilius*. The parties entreating are so unequall, that *Constantinus* seemes to have yeelded onely for popularitie, and to get the opinion of courtisie, they having done nothing to merit such favour at his hands: but *Narses* had by his valor and late victories, not onely won great honor to *Iustinian*, and to the whole Empire, but had freed *Italie* from the servitude of the *Gothes*, and by that meanes, besides many other, had merited the love and favour of *Iustinian*, who might have seemed not onely unkind, but unjust in denying the petition of one so well deserving.

13. Nay, what if the intreaty of *Narses*, and narration of *Anastasi-  
sius*

*sius* doe prove the quite contrary to that which *Baronius* from them collects, that *Vigilius* had not consented to the Synod when hee was restored upon that entreaty? *Narses* did this to gratifie<sup>h</sup> the Romane Clergy, and the Italian Bishops, who intreated him to bee a meanes for the restoring of *Vigilius* unto them. And who, I pray you, were they, or how affected in this cause of the *three Chapters*? Truly they were eager in defending of them, and for that cause rent and divided from the Easterne Churches, as *Baronius*<sup>i</sup> witnesseth. It had beene no gratifying, but a very heart grieffe and vexation to such, to have *Vigilius* the condemner of those Chapters, that is, in their judgement, an heretike, restored unto them. It was *Vigilius*, the defender of those Chapters, whom they desired; for whom *Narses* intreated, and whom, if any, the Emperour upon his intreaty restored; which, by the *Anastasian* narration, is made very evident; for he<sup>k</sup> sheweth, how the Emperour upon his suggestion, *mox misit iussiones suas, presens sent forth his command*, to bring *Vigilius* and therelt from exile. He sent not to see if they would consent to the Synod, and upon their consent to release them; but, without any questioning of that matter, hee commands that they, howsoever they stood affected, should be free, and brought out of banishment; when they were returned, did the Emperour aske them one word, whether they would consent to the Synod; or no? He did not; but al that he demanded of them was this, *vultu habere Vigilius*, will yee have *Vigilius* to continue your Pope, as hee was before, or will you have *Pelagius*, who is here among you? A demonstration, that *Vigilius* had not then consented to the Synod, when the Emperour said this; for there was no cause, either to deprive *Vigilius*, or elect any other in his roome, but his persisting in heresie, had he consented to the Synod; and condemned the *Three Chapters*, the Emperour should have done wrong unto him, to have suffered any other to have beene chosen: nay, the See being full, *Pelagius* could not, though all the banished Clergy had desired it, have beene chosen Bishop in his stead. Seeing then, both the Emperours words; and the answer of the Clergy, as *Anastasius* relateth them, doe shew, that if they had pleased they might lawfully have chosen another Pope; and seeing they could not by right have done that, unlesse *Vigilius* had continued in his pertinacious defence of heresie; even hereby it may be perceived, that at his restoring he persisted in the same hereticall minde of which he was before; and that hee had not then consented to the Synod, nor to the condemning of those *Three Chapters*. So blinded was the Cardinall in this cause, that he could not, or rather would not see how his owne reason, drawne from the intreaty of *Narses*, and the narration of *Anastasius*, doth quite overthrow the conclusion which by them he intended to confirme.

14. And all this have I said upon supposall onely of the truth of that narration touching *Narses* his intreatie, and the Emperours yeelding thereupon, to restore *Vigilius* out of exile. But now I must adde another answer, which I feare will bee much more displeasing to the Cardinal and his friends, and that is, that this whole narration touching the exile of *Vigilius* after the Synod, the intreaty of *Narses*, the restoring

<sup>h</sup> Tunc adunatus clerus rogaverunt Narsem, ut rogaret Principem, &c.

<sup>i</sup> Anast. in vita Vig.

<sup>k</sup> Cum (Vigilius) cerneret universum Orientem ab Ecclesia Romana divisum, nisi Synodo consentiret. Bar. an. 553. nu. 235  
<sup>k</sup> Anast. in vita Vig.



storing him from that banishment, and the rest depending thereon, is all untrue, & fictitious, such as hath no ground in the whole world, but onely the Cardinals owne Poeticall pate: For the manifesting whereof I will insist on the two principall points in the Cardinals narration, the untruth of which being declared, all the rest will easly be acknowledged to bee untrue and fabulous.

1 Bar. 554. nu. 1.

in *Victor Tumen-*  
*ensis auctor*  
*hujus operis, post*  
*custodias simul*  
*et plagas primo*  
*et secundo exilio*  
*egit Mauritania,*  
*tertio Alexan-*  
*drina, pro trium*  
*capitulum*  
*desertione. Vict.*  
*in Chron. an. 14.*  
*(corrupto legi-*  
*tur 15.) post C.*  
*ful. Basilij.*  
*in Iliod. lib. de*  
*virtu illust. ca.*  
*25. ex Egypto*  
*rursus Constan-*  
*tinopolim evoca-*  
*tus, &c.*  
*d. Corrupte legi-*  
*tur 17. in Chron.*  
*Vict.*

15. The former concerns the restoring of *Vigilius* out of Banishment. *Baronius* following *Anastasius*, saith, that the Emperour, together with *Vigilius* restored all the rest who were banished with him, *Dimisit omnes cum Vigilio*, and by name *Pelagius* is exprested to bee one of them, of whom the Emperour then said, *Hic habetis Pelagium, you have here Pelagius*: *Vigilius* then with him, by name, among the rest was dismissed home. A very fiction and fable, witnesse whereof *Victor* Bishop of *Tunee*, who then lived, and who himselfe<sup>m</sup>, after imprisonment and whipping was banished into three severall places, for defending the *Three Chapters*, and after that was brought to *Constantinople*<sup>n</sup>, where hee was an eye witnesse of the most things there happening about this cause. Hee having set downe the time of *Vigilius* death, that he dyed in *Sicily*, in the 16<sup>o</sup> year after the Coss. of *Basilij*, addeth in the next yeare concerning *Pelagius*, that he, being that yeare called from banishment, which he sustained for defence of the *Three Chapters*, did then condemne them, and then was ordained Bishop of *Rome*, which demonstrateth the vanity of the *Anastasian* and *Baronian* tale: how could the Emperour say, You have *Pelagius* here, when *Pelagius* was then, and after that in exile? How did the Emperour dismiss them all, and particularly *Pelagius*, when *Vigilius* was sent home, seeing *Pelagius* remained in exile till *Vigilius* was dead? But that which I principally collect is this: Seeing *Vigilius*, by the Cardinals narration, was not freed from exile, nor consented to the Synod, but at the same time when *Pelagius* was released; and seeing it is certaine, by the testimony of *Victor*, that *Vigilius* was not freed, nor consented unto the Synod at that time, (for *Vigilius* was dead before *Pelagius* was released) it hence certainly ensueth, that *Vigilius* neither was freed from exile, nor at all consented unto the fift Synod after his exile.

p Bar. an. 553.  
nu. 172.

16. The other, which is indeed the speciall point, concerns the banishment of *Vigilius* after the end of the Synod, which *Baronius* so often mentioneth, and on which depends the whole fable, this banishment being in very deed nothing else than a *Baronian* fiction; the author, and the onely author whom *Baronius* names for prooffe of this banishment, is *Anastasius*: and because the Cardinall in good discretion would name the best author, and authority which hee had; him, whose antiquity and name might gaine credit to the narration: it is not to bee doubted but *Anastasius* was the best, most credible, and authentike author, which the Cardinall had for this banishment: of him then *Baronius* saith thus, *Liquet ex Anastasio Vigilium in exilium deportatum fuisse*; It is evident by *Anastasius*, that *Vigilius* and those who were with him were caried into banishment. True, that is evident indeed by *Anastasius*: But why did the Cardinall omit the principall point to be proved? why said he not, *Vigilius* to have been caried into banishment

ment

ment after the end of the Synod, or caried for not consenting with the Synod in their condemning of the *Three Chapters*? why said he not, this is evident by *Anastasius*? Will you be pleased to know the reason herof? It is this, because, *hoc non liquet ex Anastasio*; nay, because, *contrarium liquet ex Anastasio*, *Anastasius* is so farre from saying as the Cardinall doth, that *Vigilius* was banished after the end of the Councell, or for not consenting to the Councell, that hee saith the quite contrary, and contradictheth all that the Cardinall hath said touching that banishment, both for the time, and for the cause thereof. The cause of the Anastasian banishment of *Vigilius* was, for that hee refused to restore *Anthimus* to the See of *Constantinople*, whence hee was justly ejected by Pope *Agapetus*, and a generall Councell, more than ten<sup>r</sup> yeares before *Vigilius* came to *Constantinople*, and the time of this Anastasian banishment was two yeares after *Vigilius* came to *Constantinople*, and while *Theodora* was alive, which was long before the fift Synod was assembled. This, and no other banishment of *Vigilius* is to be found in *Anastasius*; from this, and no other it is, that *Anastasius* saith, he was freed by the entreaty of *Narses*, remaining an exile untill that time. Now this *ex diametro* fighteth with that exile which *Baronius* hath devised, the time of the Baronian banishment was after the end<sup>n</sup> of the fift Synod, that is, about five<sup>r</sup> yeares after the death of *Theodora*; til then *Baronius* wil acknowledge no banishment of *Vigilius*. The cause of the Baronian banishment was not *Anthimus*, nor the restoring of him, but onely<sup>r</sup> his not yeelding to the fift Synod, and refusing to condemne the *Three Chapters*. So the Cardinall's owne witnessse: yea, his onely witnessse is so farre from proving what hee pretends, and affirms, that upon his narration is demonstrated the quite contrary: For if *Vigilius* was banished in the life time of *Theodora*, as *Anastasius* declareth, and there remained till by *Narses* intreaty he was released; then most certainly was hee not cast into banishment after the end of the fift Synod, nor for refusing to consent therunto, which is the fiction of *Baronius*.

16. And for more evidence that the same which I said is the banishment by *Anastasius*, I might alleage *Bellarmino*<sup>2</sup>, and others, but omitting them, let us heare that worthy author, to whom *Binius*<sup>2</sup> referres us concerning this matter, *Nicholas Sanders*, He<sup>o</sup> thus writeth, *That Vigilius was sent into banishment, because he would not restore Anthimus: the Romane Pontificall* (so he calls the booke of *Anastasius*) doth testifie; and besides it, *Aimonius*, *Paulus Diaconus*, *Marianus Scorus*, *Platina*, *Blondus*, *Petrus de Natalibus*, *Martinus Polonus*, *Sabellicus*, and it may be gathered out of *Nicephorus*. Thus *Sanders*: who might have added *Sigebert*<sup>c</sup>, who placeth his banishment divers yeares before the fift Councell; *Albo*<sup>d</sup> *Floriacensis*, who hath the same words with *Anastasius*, *Naclerus*<sup>d</sup>, *Regino*<sup>e</sup>, *Hermanus*<sup>f</sup> *Cötraetus*, *Gotofridus* & *Viterbiensis*, *Otho Frisingensis*<sup>h</sup>, *Palmerius*<sup>i</sup>, their owne *Genebrard*<sup>k</sup>, *Stapleton*<sup>l</sup>, and many others: These following *Anastasius* relate the cause of his banishment to have bin the not restoring of *Anthimus*; & the time, before the death of the Emperesse *Theodora*. Nor can I finde so much as one, either an-

q Per biennium  
fuere contention-  
es de Anthimo,  
sed Vigil. nulla-  
tenus voluit con-  
sentire, &c. A-  
nast. in vit. Vig.  
x Conc. illud sub  
Menna, ubi An-  
thimus est depo-  
situs, habitum est  
an. 536. Bar. illu-  
an. nu. 72. Vig-  
venit Constanti-  
nopolim an. 542.  
Bar. illo a. nu. 26  
f Per biennium,  
&c. Anast. loc.  
cit.  
x Non fecerunt  
me, ut video, ve-  
nire ad se Iusti-  
niam et Theodora-  
ra, sed Diosc-  
orus et Eleutheria.  
Anast. ibid.  
u Bar. an. 553.  
nu. 221. et seq.  
x Nam Theodora  
obijt an. 548.  
Bar. eo an. nu. 24  
cöc. 5. b. b. illu an.  
553. Bar. eo an.  
y Pontifex (Vi-  
gilius) non aliam  
ob causam in ex-  
ilium actus est,  
nisi quod s. Sy-  
nodum minime  
probare voluisset  
Bar. an. 554.  
nu. 4.  
x Quo circa  
(quia potuit  
Anthimum resti-  
tuere) ab irata  
Imperatrice in  
exilium missus  
fuit Vigilius, &  
misere vexatus  
usq. ad mortem.  
Bell. lib. 4. de  
Pont. Rom. ca. 10  
g Conigit.  
a De Vigilio et  
tota ejus causa  
vid. Sandersam.  
Bin. not. in vit.  
Vigil. pa. 478 b.  
b Sand. lib. 7. de  
vish. Monarch.  
ad an. 537.  
c Sig. an. 546.  
d Alb. Flor. in  
vita Vig.  
d Nacl. an. 540  
e Regin. an. 559.  
f Herm. an. 547.  
g Gotof. an. 527.  
h Otho an. 528.  
i Palm. in Chr. an. 557.  
k Geneb. an. 537.  
l Stapl. Counterbi. ca. 39.

cient or later writer, who saith, with *Baronius*, that hee was banished after the fift Councell, and for refusing to consent unto it; what a rare Poeticall conceit hath the Cardinall, who can make such a noble discourse of that fictitious banishment, and commend it as an historicall narration, for the warrant of which he had not so much as one writer, (and one is a small number) ancient or late, upon whose credit and authoritie he might report it; and for that one witnesse *Anastasius*, whom he nameth, he is so farre from testifying it, that he doth clearly testifie the quite contrary, yea, *Baronius* himselfe was not ignorant hereof, but knew right well *Anastasius* to referre <sup>m</sup> the beating of *Vigilius*, his flight to *Chalcedon*, the other indigne usage set downe by him, and his exile, to the time while *Theodora* lived; and therefore hee taxeth *Anastasius*, for confounding those things, and referring them to that time, whereas himselfe placeth them after the death <sup>n</sup> of *Theodora*: And yet for all this, though he knew *Anastasius* to teach the quite contrary, yet was not the Cardinall afraid, nor ashamed to allege *Anastasius* for a witnesse, that *Vigilius* was cast into banishment after the fift Councell, and for refusing to consent unto it, and to say of this banishment, *Liquet ex Anastasio*, it is clearly knowne out of *Anastasius*; whereas not that, but the quite contrarie, *Liquet ex Anastasio*.

17. From hence now there issueth another consequent to bee remembered. It is agreed by all, who mention any banishment of *Vigilius*, and it is confessed also by *Baronius*, that *Vigilius* was but once banished, and from that one freed by the intreaty of *Narses*: Now that one cannot bee the Baronian banishment, for of it there is no proofe at all to bee found, no one author to witnesse it, but the Cardinall and his owne *avros opa*, which in matters of fact done some thousand and more yeares before the Cardinall was borne, is of no worth at all, nor can be esteemed ought but one of his owne dreames and figments. Again, that one cannot bee the Anastasian banishment, which is said to happen before the death of *Theodora*, more than foure yeares before the fift Councell; for it is certaine by the Acts of the fift Synod <sup>o</sup>, that *Vigilius* at that time was at *Constantinople*; yea, that untill then he lived and dwelt <sup>p</sup> at *Constantinople*. Seeing then *Vigilius* was neither banished before the Councell, as *Anastasius* saith, nor banished after the Councell, as *Baronius* saith, it followeth, which indeed is very truth, that *Vigilius* was not at all banished, but all which is reported of his banishment, and all that depends thereon, is fictitious and Poeticall, devised by two *Bibliothecarij* to his Holinesse; the former, and precedent to the Councell, is an Anastasian; the other, following the Councell, is a Barbarian Poeme; but both Poems both fabulous and Æsopical narrations.

18. And truly, might wee be allowed to imitate the Cardinals Arte in disputing, this matter would easily be made plaine. There is one Topicke place of arguing *à testimonio negativo*, which is very familiar to *Baronius* in his *Annals* <sup>q</sup>, and it is defended by *Gretzer* in his *Apology* <sup>r</sup> for *Baronius*; let us take but one example, and that also in this our present cause concerning *Vigilius*. There is in *Anastasius* <sup>t</sup> a narration, how *Vigilius* was violently puld away from Rome,

by

In hoc plane  
tempore accidit  
se noscuntur, qua  
Anastasius jun-  
git, imo confun-  
dit cum prioribus  
que accide-  
runt vivente ad-  
huc Theodora.  
Bar. an. 552.  
nu. 8.  
in Cetera qua  
sequuntur (in A-  
nastasio) post ob-  
itum Theodora  
contingunt.  
Bar. an. 547.  
nu. 27. Inter illa  
cetera est Vigili  
exilium.

in Conc. 5. Coll. 1.  
23 at 8.  
Contigit Vigi-  
lium in hac ro-  
gia urbe degen-  
tem, omnibus in-  
teresse, &c. Coll.  
8. pa. 584. a.  
q. Vid. Bar. an.  
774. nu. 104. 1.  
r Respondisse  
vult hanc argu-  
mentandi ratio-  
nem (ab autori-  
tate negativo) in  
eis presertim  
qua ad histori-  
am spectant, non  
esse prosum in-  
firmam et elum-  
bem. Grete, A-  
pol. pro Bar. ca. 1  
S. Perinius.  
I. Anast. in vit.  
Vigil.



by *Anthemius Scribanus*, sent thither for that purpose, by the Em-  
presse; how he was apprehended in the Church, thrust into the  
shippe; how the Romans followed reviling him, cursing him, and  
casting stones and dung at him, praying that a mischief might goe  
with him. Thus it is historified by *Anastasius*. The like is mentioned  
by many others, who borrowed it out of *Anastasius*; by *Aimoni*\*, by  
the *Historia Miscella*<sup>u</sup>, going under the name of *Paulus Diaconus*, though  
it be not his; by *Marianus*<sup>+</sup> *Scotus*, by *Hermanus*<sup>?</sup> *Contractus*, by *Siga-  
bert*<sup>+</sup>, by *Luitprandus*<sup>+</sup> *de vitis Pontificum*, as the booke is called, by *Al-  
bo*<sup>b</sup> *Floriacensis*, by *Platina*<sup>c</sup>, by *Conrade*<sup>d</sup>, by *Naucerus*<sup>e</sup>, by *Marti-  
nus*<sup>f</sup> *Polonus*, by *Blondus*<sup>g</sup>, by *Krantzius*<sup>h</sup>, by *Sigonius*<sup>i</sup>, & others. Heare  
now the Cardinals censure of this narration of *Anastasius*, and the rest  
who followed him; *Apertimendacij redarguitur Anastasius; Anastasius*  
*is convicted of a manifest lye herein; and how prove you that, my*  
*Baronius? res adeo ignominiosa, so ignominious a matter as this is, could not*  
*have beene unknowne to the Authors, who writ most accurately the*  
*A&S of their times, and those were Facundus and Procopius, the Cardi-  
nall names no moe: from the silence and omission of this matter in*  
*them two, he concludes Anastasius to be a lyar; and his narration, se-  
conded by many moe, to be a lye.*

19. Let now but the like liberty of disputing a *Testimonio negative*,  
be allowed unto us, and the Baronian banishment (to begin with that)  
must be rejected, banished, and set in the same ranke with that lye of  
*Anastasius*; for thus wee may argue: This banishment of *Vigilius* after  
the end of the fift Councell; and for refusing to consent unto it, is  
neither mentioned by *Victor* Bishop of *Tunen*, nor by *Liberatus*, nor by  
*Evagrius*, nor by *Procopius*, who all then lived, (and in relating the af-  
faires of the Church, were full out as exact as *Facundus* and *Procopius*)  
nor by *Photius*, nor by *Zonaras*, nor by *Cedrenus*, nor by *Nicephorus*, nor  
by *Glicus*, nor by *Constantinus Manasses*, nor by *Anastasius*, nor by *Paulus*  
*Diaconus*, nor by *Aimoni*, nor by *Luitprandus*, nor by *Albo Floriacen-  
sis*, nor by *Otho Frisingensis*, nor by *Conrade* Abbat of *Vrsberge*, nor by  
*Hermanus Contractus*, nor by *Sigebert*, nor by *Lambertus Scaffnaburgen-  
sis*, nor by *Martinus Polonus*, nor by *Gotofridus Viserbienensis*, nor by *Al-  
bertus Stadensis*, nor by *Vernerus*, nor by *Marianus Scotus*, nor by *Rhegi-  
no*, nor by *Bede*, nor by *Platina*, nor by *Naucerus*, nor by *Tritemius*, nor by  
*Krantzius*, nor by the *magnum Chronicon Belgicum*, nor by the *Chronicon*  
*Reicherpergensse*, nor by *Chronico Germanicum per Monachum Herveldensem*,  
nor by *Chronica Compendiosa*, or *Compilatio Chronologica*, nor by *Blon-  
dus*, nor by *Sabellicus*, nor by *Aventinus*, nor by *Huldericus Mutius*, nor  
by *Sigonius*, nor by *Palmerius*, nor by *Karantz*, nor by *Papirius Massoni-  
us*, nor by *Genebrard*, nor by *Sanders*, nor by *Stapleton*; and I challenge  
the welwillers of *Baronius*, by that love they beare unto him, & his e-  
stimatiō, to name if they can but any one writer before *Baronius*, who  
affirmeth *Vigilius* to have beene banished after the Synod, for not  
consenting unto it, that thereby it may be knowne, that their great An-  
nalist playes the Historian, and not the Poet, in relating the Ecclesia-  
sticall affaires of the Church: Or if they can at any time doe this,  
(which I am verily perswaded they neither will, nor ever can per-  
forme)

*Populus cepit  
jaculari post eum  
lapides, fustes, et  
cacabos, et dice-  
re, Fames tua  
tecum, male in-  
venias, ubi va-  
dis, &c.*

*\* Aim. lib. 2. de  
gest. Franc. ca. 32  
u Hist. misc. lib. 1  
16.*

*x Mar. an. 553.*

*y Her. an. 547.*

*z Sig. an. 543.*

*a Luitp. in vita*

*Vigil.*

*b Alb. in vita*

*Vig.*

*c Plat. in vita*

*Vig.*

*d Contr. Ab. vrf.*

*per. an. 527.*

*e Nauc. an. 540.*

*f Mart. in vita*

*Vig.*

*g Blond. Dec. 1.*

*lib. 6.*

*h Krant. Met.*

*lib. 2.*

*i Sigeb. lib. 19.]*

*de Dec. Imp.*

*an. 545.*

*k Bar. an. 546.*

*nu. 54.*

forme) yet seeing none of all these doe mention that banishment, truly if *Baronius*, from the silence of two writers, might conclude against *Anastasius*, that he was a liar in the former narration, I thinke none will deny; but *à fortiori*, it will follow, that seeing more than two score are silent in this matter, it may farre more justly bee said, *aperti mendacij redarguitur*, which is the Cardinals owne doome: and words that hee bestoweth on *Anastasius*: and here much more fitly may the Cardinals reason take place, *res adeo ignominiosa, so ignominiosa a matter*, may, so glorious a peece of martyrdom on the Popes part, as the banishment and cruell persecution of the Pope, the chiefe Bishop in the world, for such a cause, as for not assenting to the Synod, could not have bin unknowne unto those writers, who most diligently prosecute the affaires of their times, and such as concerned the Church: Nay, from the most of these wee may draw an affirmative argument also, and reason, more strongly than the Cardinall doth in his disputes. *Anastasius*, *Aiminius*, *Dionysius*, *Platina*, and divers moe of the forenamed authors, to the number at least of twenty, affirme, *Vigilius* was banished before the Synod, and in the life time of *Theodorus*; and withall teach but one banishment of *Vigilius*; and therefore they not onely are silent of that which the Cardinall saith, but they say the quite contrary unto him; and so, both by their silence, and by their speech refute that, as an untruth, which the Cardinall so positively and historically narrateth.

20. Now, as the negative kinde of arguing disproves the Baronian, so doth it also the Anastasian banishment, and forcibly concludes, that *Vigilius* was not at all banished, either before, or after the Council; for there is no banishment at all of *Vigilius* mentioned, either by *Victor*, or by *Liberatus*, or by *Evagrius*, or by *Procopius*, who all lived & writ at that time, or by *Photius*, or by *Zonaras*, or by *Cedrenus*, or by *Glicus*, or by *Constantinus Manasses*, or by *Nicephorus*, or by *Aiminius* (though *Sanders* falsely affirmed them to teach this) or by *Luitprandus*, or by *Bede*, or by *Krantzins*, or by *Mutius*, or by *Papirius Massinius*, or by *Caranza*, besides others. Adde now here againe the Cardinals words, *Res adeo ignominiosa*, surely so ignominious and shameful a fact, as the banishing of a Pope, could not have beene unknowne to those who writ (as exactly as *Facundus* and *Procopius*) the Ecclesiasticall affaires, and occurrents in their times; and therefore seeing these so many, so exact writers, mention not that Anastasian banishment of *Vigilius*, it may be rightly concluded, that *Anastasius* therein *aperti mendacij redarguitur*; or if none but the Cardinall may give the lye to *Anastasius*, yet, confessing his narration to be untrue, let us leave that as a priviledge of the Cardinals, that he alone shal bestow lies, for liveries, upon *Anastasius*. Nay, seeing none of these Writers mention any banishment at all of *Vigilius*, it must further be concluded from their silence, that *Vigilius* neither first nor last, neither before, nor after the Synod was banished, but that the whole narration, touching his banishment, is a meere fiction and fable, devised, partly by *Anastasius*, and partly by *Baronius*.

21. Which may much rather be affirmed, considering that *Victor*, who

who was himselfe exiled, and brought to *Constantinople*, is not onely careful, but even curious; (that I say not proud) in recounting the most eminent persons, specially Bishops, which were either depofed, or imprisoned, or banished about this cause of the *three Chapters*, either before or after the Synod. In this ranke he nameth *Benenatus* Bishop of *Iustiniana*, *Zoilus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, *Reparatus* Bishop of *Carthage*, *Verecundus* Bishop of *Nica*, *Macarius* Bishop of *Ierusalem*, *Rufinus* a *Romane* Deacon, *Felix* a Monke of *Guilla*, *Frontinus* Bishop of *Salone*, *Theodosius* Bishop of *Sebarsuse*, himselfe being Bishop of *Tunen*, and *Pelagius* then a Deacon, but afterwards Bishop of *Rome*, and successor to *Vigilius*. Had *Baronius* this negative argument à *testimonio* in hand, how would hee insult, and even triumph in it? how easily would he perswade the world, that certainly Bishop *Victor*, who by name, and so particularly, recounteth meaner Bishops, yea, Deacons and Monkes, who suffered banishment for this cause, would never have omitted the Prince of Bishops, had hee beene exiled for it, as they were. That one example had graced the defenders of the *Three Chapters*, more than twenty, nay, than twenty hundred besides, seeing by this it would have beene evident, that the Oracle of the world, the infallible Iudge had sealed the truth of that cause with his glorious banishment, which is a kinde of Martyrdome. *Anastasius*, *Diaconus*, *Otho*, and all the rest, who say he was banished, should have had the lye an hundred times at the Cardinals hands, for saying that he was banished, either before or after the Councell, rather than Bishop *Victor*, who then lived at *Constantinople*, and was fellow-partner in those troubles and banishments, should have beene thought either ignorant or forgetfull to expresse that banishment of *Vigilius*, had there beene truly any at all.

*1 Vig. in Chron.*  
*an. 8. post Coss.*  
*Bas.*

22. Thus from the Cardinals owne Topicks it is concluded, that both the *Anastasian*, & the *Baronian* banishments are both fictitious: Nor can I find what they can except against our Negative Argument, wch will not more forcibly refute many of the Cardinals disputes, unlesse perhaps, as *Gretzer* answers in defence of *Baronius*, in another cause, that the old Logick rule, *Ex puris negativis nihil sequi*, holds only in Syllogismes, but not in Enthymems (for which subtilty I doubt not but the very Sophisters in our Vniversities will soundly deride him) so in this they will say, which, with as good warrant and reason, they may, that an agument à *testimonio negativo*, holds onely in the Cardinals Annals, or when somewhat is to be proved for the Pope, or his cause; but it never holds when ought makes against the Pope, and the Cardinall, or makes for the Protestants, and their cause.

*m Gretz. Apol.*  
*pro Bar. ca. 1.*  
*§ Respondet.*

23. But if *Anastasius*, in this narration be fabulous, what shall wee say of *Aimonius*, and al those other Writers, who mention this banishment of *Vigilius*, as well as doth *Anastasius*? What else can bee said, then that which *Ierome* saith of divers of the ancient Writers? Before that Southerne Devill *Arius* arose at *Alexandria*, innocenter quadam, & minus cautè loquuti sunt; the ancients spake certaine things in simplicitie, and not so warily, which cannot abide the touch, nor avoide the reprehension of perverse men: Or that which Saint *Austen* observes in

*n Hier. Apol. 1.*  
*adver. Ruf. ca.*  
*223.*

*o Aug. lib. 3. de*  
*doct. Christ. ca.*  
*33.*



himselfe, and Tyconius; *Non erat expertus hanc haresin*; Tyconius had not to deale with this heresie of the Pelagians, as I have said: It hath made us much more vigilantiores, diligentioresque; much more diligent, and vigilant, in scanning of this point, than Tyconius was, who had no enemy to stir up his diligence: Right so it falls out betwixt those Writers, and us of this age. Aimonius, Otho, Platina, and the rest found the banishment of Vigilinus, and much like stuffe, as it is historied in Anastasius: they, in simplicitie and harmelesse innocency, tooke it upon his credit. The question about the Popes Cathedrall Infallibility, about Vigilinus hereticall Constitution, and such like controversies, were not moved in their dayes, and therefore they spake of these things, innocenter, & minus causè, as Ierome saith of the Fathers; and because they were not distrustfull of Anastasius, they writ not so warily of these matters, as others, whose industry, by the manifold frauds of Baronius, as of another Arius, hath beene whetted, and they compelled to sift the truth more narrowly than they, wanting opposites and oppugners, did: It fell out to them as it did to Ierome himselfe. Ruffinus had set out a book in defence of Origen, under the name of Pamphilus the Martyr: Ierome at the first, and for divers yeares, beleev'd the booke to have beene indeed written by Pamphilus, as Ruffinus said it was: *Credidi Christiano, Credidi Monacho*: I never dreamed, that such an horrible wickednesse, as to forge writings, and call them by the name of Martyrs, could come from a Christian, from a Monke, from Ruffinus: but when the question about Origen was once set on foote, Ierome then sought our every corner, every Copie, every Library that hee could come to, and so discovered the whole forgery. The very like hapned to Otho, Platina, and the rest; they found this fabulous narration of the banishment of Vigilinus, and the consequents upon it, in the booke of Anastasius, the Writer of the Popes lives, of the Pontificall, the keeper of the Popes Library, a man of great name and note for learning, one in high favour with the Popes of his time; they never suspected or dreamed that such a man, a Christian, a Monke, that Anastasius would deale so perfidiously, and record such horrible untruths: But now, the question about Anastasius credit, and the cause of Vigilinus, which was not moved in their dayes, being sifted and come to the skanning, the whole forgery and falshood of Anastasius is made evident to the world, both in this, and in a number the like narrations. Anastasius is not the man the world tooke him for; his writings are full of lyes and fictions: Not the Legendair more fabulous than Anastasius; hee for a long time was the Master of the Popes Mint; by his meanes the royal stamp of many golden Fathers, yea, of some Councils also, and infinire historicall narrations, was set upon Brasse, Lead, and most base metals; and then being brought, like so many Gibeonites in old Coates, and mouldy coverings, Anastasius gave them an high place, and honourable entertainment in the Popes Librarie, and with them ever since hath the Church of God beene pestered; they past for current among men delighted in darknesse and errors, such as had no need to bring them to the touch; but the light hath now manifested them, and made both them and their author to be detested.

p Vnus sub nomine Pamphili à te editus est, et; eadem, quæ sub Pamphili nomine à te ficta sunt. Hier. Apol. 2. Cont. Ruff. pa. 226.  
q Inter ceteros translatores posui et hunc librum à Pamphilo editum, ita putans esse, ut à te et tuis discipulis fuerat divulgatum. Ibid.  
r Hier. Apol. 3. contra Ruff. pa. 218.  
[Hier. locis citat.

24. You see now the weaknesse, nay the nullity of the Cardinalls reason, even of his *Achilles*, drawne from the Emperours fact, in restoring or freeing him from exile, which he would never have done, unless he had consented to the Synod. For, seeing we have proved that *Vigilius* was not at all banished, it clearly thence ensueth, that neither *Narses* entreated to have him freed from exile, neither did the Emperour upon that entreaty free him from exile, neither did *Vigilius* consent to the Synod after his exile, and all the other consequents, which upon this foundation of *Vigilius* his exile the Cardinall builds like so many Castles in the ayre, they all of themselves doe now fall to the ground: and which I specially observe, it hence followeth, that *Vigilius* did never after the end of the fift Councell consent unto it, or to the condemning of the *Three Chapters*, either by his Pontificall decree, or by his personall profession: for the Cardinall assures us, and delivers it as a truth, which of necessity must bee granted, that his consent, (whether personall or pontificall) was at no other time; but when he was loosed out of banishment.

*t Necessitate est affirmare. Bar. an. 554. nu. 4.*

25. Now at that time it neither was nor could be; for there was never any such time, nor was hee at all banished; and therefore upon the Cardinalls owne words we are assured that *Vigilius* after the end of the Synod never revoked his *Constitution* published in defence of the *Three Chapters*, never after that time condemned the *Three Chapters*, or consented to the Synod, either by any pontificall, or so much as by a personall profession; but that hee still persisted in his hereticall defence of the same Chapters, and subject to that censure of *Anathema*, which the fift Councell denounced against all the defenders of those Chapters.

26. Some perhaps will marvell, or demand how it should come to passe, that the Emperour, who as wee have shewed was so rigorous and severe in imprisoning, banishing, and punishing the defenders of the *Three Chapters*, and such as yielded not to the Synod, should wink at *Vigilius* at this time, who was the chiefest and most eminent of them all: which doubt *Baronius* also moveth, saying, he who published his Edict against such as contradicted him, *Num Vigilio peperit, may wee think he would spare Vigilius*, and not banish him who set forth a *Constitution* against the Emperours Edict? *Minime quidem*. Truly the Emperour would never spare him, saith the Cardinall. Yes, the Emperour both would and did spare him. Belike the Cardinall methinks *Iustinian* by his owne irefull and revengefull minde. Had the Cardinall beene crossed and contradicted, nothing but torture, exile, or fire from heaven to consume such rebels, would have appeased his rage. *Iustinian* was of a farre more calme, and therefore more prudent spirit. *Vigilius* deserved, and the Emperour might in justice for his pertinacious resisting the truth, have inflicted upon him either imprisonment, or banishment, or deposition, or death. It pleased him to doe none of all these, nor to deale with the Pope according to his demerits. *Iustinian* saw that *Vigilius* was but a weak and silly man, and of no constancy and resolution, a very weathercocke in his judgement concerning causes of faith: that hee had said and said many things,

*u Bar. an. 555. ] nu. 222.*

*1. No. 7. nu. 2.*

things, and then by his *Apollitical* authority judicially defined both his sayings being contradictory, to be true; and truths of the Catholike faith: the Emperour was more willing to pity this imbecility of his judgement, than punish that fit of perversenesse which then was come upon him. Had *Vigilius* beene so stiffe and inflexible as *Vistor*, as *Libertus*, as *Facundus* were, whom no reason, nor perswasion would induce to yeeld to the truth, its not to be doubted but hee had felt the Emperours indignation as well as any of them. But *Vigilius* like a wise man tooke part with both, he was an *Ambodexter*, both a defender, and a condemner of the *three Chapters*, both on the Emperours side, and against him: and because hee might bee reckoned on either side, having given a judiciall sentence as well for condemning the *three Chapters*, as for defending them: it pleased the Emperour to take him at the best, and ranke him among the condemners, at least to winke at him as being one of them, and not punish him among the defenders of those Chapters.

27. Nor could the Emperour have any way provided better for the peace and quiet of the Church, than by such connivence at *Vigilius*, and letting him passe as one of the condemners of those Chapters. The banishing of him would have hardned others, and that far more than his consent after punishment would have gained: the former, men would have ascribed it to judgement; the latter, to passion, and wearinesse of his exile. But now accounting him as a condemner of the *Three Chapters*, if any were fild by his authority and judgement, the Emperour could shew them; Loe here you have the judiciall sentence of the Pope for condemning the *three Chapters*: if his authority were despised by others, then his judiciall sentence in defence of the Chapters could doe no hurt: and why should the Emperour banish him if he did no hurt to the cause? nay it was in a manner necessary for the Emperour to winke at him, as at a condemner of the *three Chapters*: for he had often testified to the Councell, that *Vigilius* had condemned both by words and writings those Chapters, hee sent the Pops owne letters to the Synod, to declare and testifie the same: those letters as well of the Emperour as of the Pope testifying this, were inserted into the Synodall Acts. Had the Emperour banished *Vigilius* for not condemning those Chapters, his owne act in punishing *Vigilius* had seemed to crosse and contradict his owne letters, and the Synodall Acts. If *Vigilius* be a condemner of the Chapters, as you say, and the Synodall Acts record that he is, why doe yee banish him for not condemning those Chapters? If *Vigilius* bee justly banished as a defender of those Chapters, how can the Emperours letters, and Synodall Acts be true, which testifie him to be one of the condemners of those Chapters? So much did it concerne the Emperours honour, and credit of the Synod, that *Vigilius* should not be banished at that time. *Vigilius* had sufficient punishment that he stood now a convicted, condemned, and anathematized heretike by the judgement of the whole and holy generall Councell: but for any banishment, imprisonment, or other corporall punishment, the Emperour in his wisdom, in his lenity thought fit to inflict none upon him. Only he stayed him at



Constantinople for one, or as *Victor* saith, for more yeares after the Synod, to the end that before he returned, the Synodall sentence and Acts of the Councell being every where divulged, and with them, nay in them the judgement of *Vigilius* in condemning those Chapters as the Synod did, might settle if it were possible, the mindes of men in the truth, or at least serve for an Antidote against that poison, which either from the contrary constitution, or his personall presence when he should returne, could proceed.

2. And by this is easily answered all that the Cardinal and *Dimitri* collect from those great offices, gifts, rewards, and privileges with which the Emperour graced and decked *Vigilius*, and so sent him home: which the Cardinall thinkes the Emperour would never have done, unlesse *Vigilius* had consented to the Synod, and condemned the three Chapters. Truly these men can make a mountaine of a mole-hill. There is no prooffe in the world that *Vigilius* was so graced at his returne: nor that the Emperour bestowed any gifts or rewards upon him at all. That which the Emperour did was the publishing of a pragmaticall sanction, wherein are contained divers very wholesome lawes, and good orders for the government of *Italy*, and the Provinces adjoining: The date of the sanction is in August, in the eight and twenty yeare of *Iustinian*, and thirteene after the Cons. of *Basilus*, which was the next yeare after the Councell. But that *Vigilius* at that time returned, there is no solid prooffe, and *Victor* who then lived, and was present at Constantinople, puts the death of *Vigilius* in the 31. yeare of *Iustinian*, or 16. after *Basilus*, who yet by all mens account (who write of his returne) returned from Constantinople either in the same, or in the next yeare before he dyed. So uncertaine, and by *Victors* account unlikely it is, that *Vigilius* at his returne home was *omnium muneribus, donis, officiis, and privilegiis*, as they pompously set out the matter. Now it is true that the Emperour ordered and decreed those matters upon the entreaty of *Vigilius*: for so the words *pro petitione Vigili* doe make evident: but that either *Vigilius* entreated, or the Emperour granted this upon any entreaty which he made, either after his return out of exile, (which certainly he did not) or after the end of the Synod, or at the time of his returne (at which are the Cardinals tales without any prooffe) none of the Cardinals friends will be ever able to make cleare. And for my owne part, till I see some reason to the contrary, I cannot otherwise thinke, but that this petition was made by *Vigilius* some three or foure yeares before the Countell at which time *Vigilius* consented wholly with the Emperour, was in great grace and favour with him. And I am hereunto induced by that which *Procopius* expresseth: How in the 14. yeare of the Gothicke war, which is the 13. of *Iustinian*, when *Teiase* and the Gothes began to winne againe divers parts of *Italy*, which *Belisarius* had before recovered, *Vigilius* and divers *Italiani* and *Romanes*, who were then at Constantinople, *submissis & enixis postulabant ab Imperatore, did in a very submissive and earnest manner entreat the Emperour, that he would reduce all Italy into his subjection*. Now it is very likely that together with this petition they signified divers matters to the Emperour, which were before

7 *Vid. in Chron.*  
an. 16. (corrupt  
12 legitur 17.)  
post Cons. Basilij.

2 *Bar. an. 554.*  
an. 6. & Bix.  
Not. in Conc. 5.  
S. Praesidia.

2 *Proc. lib. 3. de*  
*Bell. Goth. pa.*  
193.

2 *Bar. an. 554.*  
an. 6. & Bix.

fall for his government in the Westerne parts: and this the Emperours answer then made unto them imports; who, as *Procopius* addeth, answered them, *Italiam sibi curare fore, ut hee would have a care of Italy*: but for that time hee was busie in composing the differences about Christian doctrines. The fift Synod then being ended, and all those Ecclesiasticall affaires coneluded; nor that onely, but *Totilas* and *Ticius* being both vanquished, and so the whole dominion of Italy being recovered by the victorious *Narses*, the Emperour in his 28. yeare, which was next after the Synod, performed that promise which hee had made before to *Vigilius* and the other Italians, and according to their request disposed and ordered divers matters which in that sanction are set downe.

Now if the words of the Sanction have respect (as I verily thinke they have) to that time, then all that *Baronius* collecteth from granting that sanction, and those priviledges upon the petition of *Vigilius* after his returne from exile, or after the Synod, are meere fancies and dreames. Or if it were admitted (whereof I can find no prooffe at all) that *Vigilius* made, and the Emperour granted unto him this petition after the end of the Councell, yet will it not hence follow that *Vigilius* then consented to the Synod; for as wee have before declared, the Emperour was not so eager, nor rigorous against *Vigilius*, but that upon his entreaty hee might grant to establish those Lawes, which being in themselves so commodious and behoovefull, he without any entreaty, upon the consideration of those matters, would in all likelihood have enacted. And so every joynct of the Cardinals second reason (wherein consists the very pith of his cause) drawne from the fact of *Justinian*, in restoring him from exile, and dismissing him home with gifts and priviledges, being now fully dissolved by that which hath bene said, it remaineth cleere, that notwithstanding all which the Cardinall hath yet brought, there appeares no prooffe nor token that *Vigilius* any time after the end of the Councell, either by his publike decree, as the Cardinall boasteth, or so much as by his personall profession, consented to the Synod, and the condemning of the *Three Chapters*.

This third and last reason is drawne from those darke words of *Liberatus*, where he saith, that *Vigilius* dyed, being afflicted by that heresie of the *Eurycheans*; but he was not crowned. Before wee examine the Cardinals reason grounded hereon, let us first in a word observe the Cardinals honest dealing with *Liberatus*. In that very same chapter, and in the words next before that sentence which the Cardinall alledgeth, *Liberatus* sets downe the Epistle and profession of *Vigilius*, wherein he defendeth the *Eurychean* heresie, and anathematizeth all who hold two natures in Christ as the Councell of *Chalcedon* had defined. Of that Epistle *Liberatus* witnesseth that it is the Epistle of *Vigilius*, and was truly written by him. *Baronius* seeing that to tend to the disgrace of *Vigilius*, that the Pope should be an heretike, an *Eurychean*, and should accurse all that are not such, what saith he for this matter? Truly he condemnes and rejects the testimonie of *Liberatus*; *The Epistle is not the writing of Vigilius, it is an Impostor, a forged writing*.

Baronius in 177  
cap. 17. de  
Vigilio  
cap. 17. de

Baronius in 177  
cap. 17. de  
Vigilio  
cap. 17. de

Baronius in 554  
cap. 5.  
de Liber. ca. 22.

Baronius in 554  
cap. 5.  
de Liber. ca. 22.

Baronius in 538  
cap. 5.  
de Liber. ca. 22.

ting, a counterfeit: notwithstanding all that *Liberatus* saith: So if *Liberatus* say ought distastfull to the Cardinals palate, *Liberatus* is a witness of no worth, he is utterly to be contemned, to be rejected. But if in the next words *Liberatus* say ought that seemeth to favour the Cardinals fancy, *Liberatus* then is a worthy witness, you may not take any exception against *Liberatus*, if he say that *Vigilius*, when hee dyed, had consented to the fift Synod, you must beleve him. Some would thinke this to be scarce currant dealing with his own witness, to make him sometimes more then a thousand, sometimes lesse then a Cypher, but such are almost all the Cardinals witnesses, they speak not so much for him in one place, as they doe against him in others, nor is he so willing to accept them in one, as he is ready to reject them in another. If *Liberatus* be to be credited, why doth the Cardinall reject him? If he be not to be credited, why doth the Cardinall alleage him?

31. Thus one might if he listed, elude his prooffe, and make a little sport with the Cardinals Counters. But I will let the words of *Liberatus* stand in their best value; and to see the Cardinals deduction the better, wee must consider the whole sentence of *Liberatus*, which is this; *Vigilius* writing these things (to wit, that hereticall Epistle, in defence of *Eutychianisme*) and that closely, to heretikes, continued sitting, (in the See of Rome) In whom was fulfilled that testimony of *Salomon*, they shall eate the fruit of their owne way, and they shall bee filled with their owne Counsells. *Ab ipsa heresi afflictus Vigilius, nec coronatus, qualem vita terminum suscepit, notum est omnibus: Vigilius being afflicted by that heresie, but not crowned, how hee ended his life, every man can tell.* Thus *Liberatus*. In which words as you see, there is no mention at all either of *Vigilius* his going into banishment, or returning out of banishment, or of his defending the three Chapters, or of his condemning the same Chapters, or of the Emperours either casting him into, or releasing him from exile, or of the fift Councell, or of the end thereof; and yet out of these words will *Baronius* like a very skilfull Chymick extraet, both that *Vigilius* after the end of the fift Councell was banished for defending the Three Chapters, and after that banishment, consented to the Synod, and to condemne the three Chapters. And see I pray you how the Chymick distills this. If *Liberatus*, saith he\*, being one of those who fought for the Three Chapters, had found *Vigilius, perstantem in sententia usque ad mortem, persisting untill his death in that sentence*, which in his Constitution he had published for defence of the Three Chapters, truly he would have praised *Vigilius* for a Martyr, had he dyed in such sort. But when he saith, *Vigilius* was afflicted, and not crowned, *plane alludit ad ejus exilium, he doth plainly allude to the banishment of Vigilius*, and to his forsaking or revolt from that judgement after he came from banishment. Thus doth the Cardinall glosse upon the words of *Liberatus*.

e Bar. an. 554.  
na. 5.

32. See the force of truth; The Cardinals owne words doe most fully answer his owne doubt, and explaine that truth which hee wittingly oppugneth: Had *Liberatus* found *Vigilius, perstantem in sententia usque ad mortem, constant, or persisting without any change or relenting*



in his defending the three Chapters, untill his dying day, then indeed *Vigilius* should have beene with *Liberatus* (an obstinate defender of that sentence) a glorious Martyr, at the least a worthy Confessor, and for that cause he should have beene condemned by *Liberatus*. But seeing he found him a changeling in his sentence, wavering and unconstant therein, turning his note as soone almost as he had looked the Emperour in the face, *Vigilius* by reason of that change, unconstancie, and revolt from his opinion, lost his Crowne, and all his commendation with *Liberatus*, not for any returning to condemne the *Three Chapters* after his exile, whereof in *Liberatus* there is no sound nor syllable. By publishing his *Apostolicall Constitution* in the time of the Councell for defence of those Chapters, and by his dying in that opinion, *Liberatus* found *Vigilius*, *stantem & morientem*, but not *perstantem in ea sententia usque ad mortem*, he found him standing and dying, but hee could not possibly find him persisting constantly, not persevering in that sentence which first he had embraced; for whereas he saw and knew the Synodall Acts, to testifie that for five or six yeares together, hee not onely was of a contrary judgement, but did judicially, and definitively decree the contrary, and censure also such as continued and persevered in the defence of those Chapters; this so long discontinuance, and so earnest oppugning of the defenders of those Chapters, quite interrupted his persisting and persevering in his first sentence, for this cause he lost his Crowne, and dyed *non coronatus*, in the Kalender, and account of *Liberatus*.

33. I adde further, that the words of *Liberatus* being well pondered, doe shew the quite contrary to that which the Cardinall thence collecteth. *Liberatus* as all the defenders of those Chapters, held their opposites who condemned the same Chapters, for no other then heretikes, then oppugners of the Catholike faith, and holy Councell of *Chalcedon*. And for *Vigilius*, while hee fought on their side, and against the Emperour, they honoured him as a Catholike, as a chiefe defender of the Catholike faith. As soone as *Vigilius* had consented to the Emperour, and upon his coming to *Constantinople* had condemned the *Three Chapters*, then they held him for no other then a betrayer of the faith, then an heretike, then a backslider, revolter, and lapsor from the faith, and for such they adjudged, and accursed him by name in their *Africane* Synod, at which it is most like that *Liberatus*, being a man of such note for dealing in that cause, was present; upon his returning at the time of the sixth Councell to defend againe with them the *Three Chapters*, they esteemed him as one of those *penitentes*, which after their lapsing returne againe to the profession of the faith. Had *Vigilius* after this revolted, and turned againe to condemne the same Chapters, and in that opinion dyed, as out of *Liberatus*, the Cardinall would perswade, *Liberatus* and the rest of that sect would have held him for a double heretike, for a lapsor, and relapsor from the faith, for one dying in heresie, and dying a condemned heretike by the judgement of their *Africane* Synod. Now let any man judge whether *Liberatus* would have said of such an one as hee esteemed an heretike, a condemned heretike, and to dye in heresie, that hee dyed,

f Complures Orthodoxi & ipse *Vigilius* contra eadem Capitula asserta ab Imperatore insurrexere. Bar. an. 546. nu. 38.  
g *Vigilius* arguit ut probantia vocum novitates. Facundi dictum apud Bar. an. 546. nu. 57. 58.  
h Ne Traditor videretur. Facundi dictum de *Vigilio* apud Bar. an. 547. nu. 37. Collusionem & Praevicacitatem conclamant. Bar. an. eod. nu. 49. vulgunt ubique eum impugnare Concilium Chalcedonense. Bar. an. 550. nu. 1.  
i *Vigilius* in Chron. an. 9. post Conf. Basil.

*non coronatus* ? would he have minced and extenuated the crime of heresie, of one dying in heresie, would he not much rather have said, he dyed *Damnatus, condemned*, and accursed by the judgement of their owne Synod, and therefore utterly separated from God ? Who ever read or heard, that one dying in heresie, was called by so friendly a title as *Non coronatus* ?

43. This will most clearly appeare, if we consider that the Church and Ecclesiasticall Writers doe mention as two sorts, so also two rewards of Catholike and Orthodoxall professors. The one is of those who are courageous and constant in defending the faith, such as joyfully endure torments, imprisonment, exile, and if need be, even death in selfe rather then they will renounce and forsake the faith, and these are called *coronati*. The other is of those who being timorous, and faint-hearted, yeeld to deny the truth, rather then they will endure torments or death for confessing the same; and yet by reason of that immortall seed which is in their hearts, they returne againe, and openly profess that truth from which they had before lapsed: and these are called, *Non coronati*, saved by repentance, and returning to the truth; but by reason of their former faintnesse, and lapsing, Not crowned. Both of these are Orthodoxall, and Catholikes, both of them placed in the blessed house of God, but not both in like blessed mansions and chambers of the house of God: *For in my Fathers house are many mansions*. Both of them starres, and glorious starres in heaven, but even among those heavenly starres, *one starre differeth from another in glory*. Both of them receive an infinity of glory, but in that infinitie, the weight is unequal, and the one receives but as the penny, the other as the pound or talent of that glory. Both of them blessed in the Kingdome of God, but the former not blessed onely, but crowned with blessednesse, the later blessed, but not crowned; neither with the Aureall Crowne of Martyrs, nor with the Lawrell garland of Confessors; yet still, whether *coronati*, or *non coronati*, as they both dye in the profession of the Catholike faith, so are they both rewarded with eternall glory for profession of the Catholike faith. As for heretikes such as die in heresie, and out of the Catholike faith, they are to be sorted with neither of these, they have another and a quite different ranke, *Classis* or *Predicament* of their owne. They may not have that honour done unto them, as to be called *non coronati*, which implies that they have a part in felicity, but not the Crowne. As the Church doth justly anathematize and accurse such, so are they to be ranked in the order of those to whom Christ shall say, *Goe ye cursed*. The Apostle<sup>a</sup> reckoning heresies with Idolatry, witchcraft, adultery, and the like, of which he saith, *that they which doe them shall not inherite the Kingdome of God*.

33. Hence now it doth clearly appeare, that *Liberatus* in saying that *Vigilius* dyed *Non coronatus*, cannot intend as the Cardinall most ignorantly collecteth, that *Vigilius* returned from the defence of the three Chapters to condemne the same, for that being in *Liberatus* judgement a revolt from the truth, hee thereby had by *Liberatus* beene accounted an heretike; and to dye in heresie, and so had beene in the ranke

<sup>k</sup> John 14: 2.

<sup>l</sup> 1 Cor. 15: 41.

<sup>m</sup> Mat. 25: 41.  
<sup>n</sup> Gal. 5: 19, 20.

ranke of those who are *Damnati*; but *Liberatus*, in saying he dyed <sup>non</sup> *coronatus*, doth directly teach, that he dyed in defence of those *Three Chapters*, (which, with *Liberatus*, is the Catholike faith) from which hee had lapsed; and revolted before; but seeing at the time of the Councell, hee returned againe to that opinion, and therein dyed; hee was saved, (in *Liberatus* judgement) but not crowned: By his penitence, and returning to the defence of those Chapters; he got glory, but because he had so grievously lapsed before, hee lost the crowne of glory. And this also is the reason why *Victor*, Bishop of *Tanen* menti- oneth the death of *Vigilius* in such a naked manner, neither disgra- cing him as a *Prevaricator*, as hee doth *Firmus* 2, *Primasius* 1, and *Pela- gius* 1; nor honouring him as a Martyr or Confessor, as he doth *Felix*, *Rusticus*, and *Reparatus* 1; intimating thereby, that *Vigilius* dyed in the confession and defence of the *Three Chapters*, and therefore hee could not condemne him; but yet because he was not constant in that pro- fession, he would not commend him.

36. Yea, but *Liberatus* by saying he was afflicted by that heresie; *plane alludit ad ejus exilium*, he doth plainly allude to the banishment of *Vigilius*. Plainly? Phy on such a Plain-lie out of a Cardinals mouth; he doth not so much as obscurely; nor under a cloud or mist, not any way al- lude unto it; nor intimate or insinuate ought tending thereunto; nor could hee indeed, seeing, as we have before declared, that banishment of *Vigilius* is nothing else but a fiction, partly of *Anastasius*, partly of *Baronius*; and *Liberatus* was no Prophet, that hee could allude to their idle dreams: But if he allude not to his banishment, why then saith he that *Vigilius* was afflicted by that heresie? as if there were no afflicti- ons in the world but banishment; what ere hee meant; he meant not that: And truly, whatsoever calamities or afflictions, either of body or minde, befell *Vigilius* after he had once consented to the Emperors Edi&,& to the condemning of the *Three Chapters*; (which, in *Liberatus* account, was heresie) and because it was (as hee thought) contrary to the Councell of *Chalcedon*, even the heresie of the *Eutychians*; all those did *Liberatus* impute to that his revolt from the faith, and to that *Eutychian* heresie which he then embraced; as *Liberatus* judged: Now there are two or three evident matters, which were great affli- ctions to *Vigilius*, and may well bee intended by *Liberatus*.

37. The first was the generall dislike which the Italian, Africane, and other Westerne Bishops took against him, as soone as they knew that he had consented to the Emperours Edi&, they writ against him, as one who denyed the faith, and condemned the Councell of *Chalcedon*, they censured, judged, and accursed him by their Synodall sentence; they contemned him as a temporizer; as one, who, to please the Em- perour, betrayed the faith: This was, no doubt, no small affliction to *Vigilius*, to bee disgraced, contemned, and accursed by his owne friends, to whom, by so many bands of duty and love, he was so near- ly conjoynd; and this lay upon his stomacke for five or fixe years together, even from his first comming almost, to *Constantinople*, to the time of the Councell.

38. His second affliction followed upon his change in the time of the

o *Vigilius Ro-  
manus in insula  
Sicilia moritur.*  
*Victor. Chron.*  
an. 16. post *Conf.*  
*Bas.*  
p *Firmus domi  
Principis cor-  
ruptus, assensum  
præbuit, sed in  
novi morte  
turpissima periit.*  
*Vict. ibid.*  
an. 11. post  
*Conf. Bas.*  
q *Primasius à  
Catholicis, pro  
prævaricatione  
condemnatu  
infelici morte  
extinguitur. Ib.*  
x *A prævaricato-  
ribus ordinatur.*  
*Ibid. an. 17. post  
Conf. Bas.*  
s *Reparatus exi-  
lio apud Eu-  
chaidam, gloriosa  
confessione tran-  
sit ad dominum*  
*Vict. an. 22. post  
Conf. Bas.*  
i *Bar. an. 554.*  
245.



the Councill; for though hee then, by defending the *Three Chapters*, and publishing his *Apostolicall Constitution* for defence of them, hoped to recover the love and good opinion of the Westerne Churches; yet hee exceedingly failed of that hope. Now hee was in farre worse case than before; On one side he incurred the Emperours just indignation, and made himselfe obnoxious to deprivation, banishment, death, or whatsoever punishments may bee inflicted on pertinacious, and hereticall oppugners of the faith; which, although the Emperour in his lenity did not, nor would inflict upon him; yet what a griefe is it to have all those punishments hanging, like *Damocles* sword, over his head, and sure to fall upon him, if the Emperour at any time listed to breake or cut the haire? What comfort could he have, who held not onely his dignitie, but his liberty; yea, his very life at the will and pleasure of another? On another side he had incurred the heavie and just censure of the holy generall Councell, and of all Catholikes, being by them adjudged and accursed for an heretike. On a third side the Westerne Churches, and the defenders of the *Three Chapters*, were so farre from honouring him as he expected, that they also, for all that, held him for no other than an unconstant and wavering person, one that turned his faith with every winde and weather: So, whereas at the first hee was beloved and honoured of the Westerne Churches, while hee defended the *Three Chapters*, as they did; and after that was beloved and honoured of the Emperour, and Easterne Churches, while hee, with them, condemned the *Three Chapters*: when now againe he returned to defend them, hee was contemned both of the one sort and the other; they all now esteemed no better of him than a very Wethercocke. Now whether this, to see himselfe forsaken and contemned by all, both friends and foes, both Catholikes and heretikes; whether this might not bee a corrasive to his heart, let any man duly consider with himselfe. Adde to these that corporeall anguish which caused his death; hee, if wee may trust *Anastasiu*,<sup>u</sup> *afflictus, calculi dolorem habens, mortuus est, being afflicted and vexed with paine of the stone*, or (as by *Liberatus* it may bee thought) by some more grievous disease of his body, dyed in great affliction: When there were so many afflictions lying at the heart of *Vigilius*, all which *Liberatus* imputeth to his consenting to the Emperours Ediſt, and condemning of the *Three Chapters*, which he, as the rest of the defenders of them, called heresie; was not the Cardinall, thinke you, in some extasie of his wit, when he thought, that the affliction of *Vigilius* must needs bee his owne fictitious banishment; and that *Liberatus* doth plainly allude therunto.

39. Thus all the reasons of *Baronius* being manie wayes, and manifestly declared to bee ineffectuall, to prove that last and Baronian change in *Vigilius*, after the end of the Synod, we may now safely conclude, that as *Vigilius*, after his *Apostolicall Constitution* in defence of the *Three Chapters* once published, made at no time after that, any publike, judiciall or Pontificall Decree to reverse and adnul the same; but that still stood in full power and strength untill the death of *Vigilius*; so neither did hee ever after that time declare so much as a pri-

vare dislike thereof, or a personall consent to the fift Councell, which had decreed the contrary; but pertinaciously persisting in that sentence, he both lived and dyed an hereticall defender of those *Three Chapters*. At the first he was hereticall in defending them against the Emperours Edict: at the last he was not onely hereticall, but a condemned heretike in defending them against the judiciall sentence of the holy generall Councell. In the middle time he had a fit of professing the truth, but that was only in shew, and in appearance, that so he might temporize with the Emperour, in heart hee was (as when the time of tryall came he demonstrated himselfe) an oppugner of the truth, both against the Imperiall Edict, and Synodall judgement: And therefore, as wee found him at the first an heretike; so, for all which *Baronius* hath said, or could say to the contrary, we must leave him for a condemned heretike; even such a one, as not only defended, but, by his *Cathedrall* and *Apostolicall* sentence, defined heresie to be the Catholike faith. And thus much bee spoken of the Cardinals third principall Exception, or troupe of evasions, marching under that Act of *Vigilius*, which, by his manifold changing in this cause of faith, you have fully seene.

## CAP. XVIII.

*The fourth and last Exception of Baronius, in defence of Vigilius, pretending, that the fift Councell (wherein the decree of Vigilius was condemned,) was neither a generall nor a lawfull Councell, till Vigilius confirmed the same, refused.*

1.



Here now remaineth onely the fourth and last exception of *Baronius*; in which, though being the weakest and worst of all, his whole hope now consists: In this the Cardinall brings forth all his forces, all the Engines of his wit and malice, to batter downe the authority of the fift generall Councell. Seeing it contradicted the Pope, and judicially decreed his *Apostolicall* sentence to be hereticall, it shall bee of no authority at all; it shall bee neither a generall, nor a lawfull Councell; it shall bee nothing but a Conspiracy and conventicle with *Baronius* and his friends, untill *Vigilius* doe approve the same: But heare their owne words to this purpose.

a An. 593. nu.  
224.

2. The fift Councell, saith *Baronius* <sup>a</sup>, *aliquando expers fuit omnis autoritatis, was for a time void of all authority*; yea, so void thereof, *ut nec legitima Synodus dici meruerit, that it deserved not to bee called so much as a lawfull* (much lesse a generall and lawfull) *Synod*, because it was assembled, the Pope resisting it, & was ended, the Pope contradicting it: But when afterwards it was approved by the sentence of *Vigilius*, and other succeeding Popes, then it got the title and authority of an *Oecumenicall Synod*. Again <sup>b</sup>, *The fift Councell at that time, when it was held,*

b An. 600. nu. 39.

held, could not have the name of an Oecumenicall Synod, seeing it was not lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, because the Pope, neither by himselfe, nor by his Legates would be present in it. And yet more spightfully, These things considered, plane consenties, ipsam nec Oecumenica, nec privata Synodi mereri nomen, you will consent, that the first Council deserved not the name of an Oecumenicall, no nor so much as of a private Synod; it was no Synod nor Council at all, seeing both it was assembled, resistente Pontifice, the Pope resisting it, and also pronounced sentence, contra ipsius Decretum, against the Popes Decree. Thus Baronius: in whose steps Binius treadeth, saying<sup>d</sup>, Pope Vigilius was not present in this Council, either by himselfe, or by his deputies, Contradixit eidem, he contradicted the Synod; the members assembled without the head, dum ageretur non consentit, the Pope consented not to it while it was held, nor did approve it straight after it was ended, yet it got the name, title, and authority of an Oecumenicall Council, quando ipsius Vigilius sententia, when it was afterwards approved by the sentence of Vigilius himselfe, and his successors. So Binius.

c An. eod. nu. 219

d Not. in Conc. 5. § Praesedit.

3 How, or where shall I begin? or who, though more censorious than Cato, can with sufficient gravity and severity castigate the insolency and most shamelesse dealing of these men; who, rather than one of their Popes, even Pope Proteus himselfe, shall bee thought to erre in his Cathedrall Decree of faith, care not to disgrace, to vilifie, yea, to nullifie one of the ancient and sacred generall Councils, approved, as before<sup>e</sup> we have shewed, by the whole Catholike Church? For if this Council was neither generall, nor lawfull, (as they teach) till Vigilius approved it by his Apostolicall authority, after his returne from exile; then was it never, nor as yet is either a generall or lawfull Council, seeing Vigilius, after his exile, never did, nor could approve it, as before<sup>f</sup> we have clearly proved: So this first Council must for ever be cashiered and blotted out of the ranke of Councils. And because, as their second Nicene Synod rightly disputes<sup>g</sup>, the seventh must follow the sixth, in the same ranke and order, and the sixth, the fifth, if there was no first generall and holy Council; neither can there bee any sixth, nor seventh, nor eighth, nor any other after it. So, by the assertion of these men, there are at once dashed out fourteene of those, which themselves<sup>h</sup> doe honour by the name of holy generall Councils.

e Sup. ca. 4. 22. 26. et seq.

f Sup. ca. 17.

g Omne septimum ordinatum in eadem numeratione quod res praecesserunt. C. c. 6. 22. 357. a. h Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 5.

4. I say more, the expunging of all those fourteene Councils, doth certainly follow upon the Cardinals assertion, though it were granted, that Vigilius had confirmed this first, as it is true, that Pelagius and Gregory did: For if it was (as he teacheth) neither a generall nor lawfull Synod, while the Council continued, and for that whole time while it was an assembly of Bishops; then undoubtedly it never at any time was; nor yet is either a generall or a lawfull Synod: For after the end, and dissolution thereof, it was never extant in rerum natura againe; it was ever after that time Non ens; and being neither Synod, nor yet so much as Ens, it could not possibly be either generall or lawfull. It is a Maxime, Non entis non sunt Accidentia. If while it was extant, and while it was an assembly, it was but a conventicle; if then it was not gathered in Gods name, I pray you, when was



it ever after that, gathered in Gods name? Did *Vigilius*, *Pelagius*, or *Gregory*, when they made it, by their approbation; a generall and lawfull Councell; did they, like some new *Aolus*, blow all the Bishops againe to *Constantinople*, and assemble them the second time in the Popes name, that so they might be said to be gathered in Gods name? Let their Popes trie, if by all their magicall skill, or omnipotent power, they can make any one of those *Africane* Councils under *Cyprian*, a Generall; or make the *Arimine*, *Syrman*, or second *Ephesine*, a lawfull Councell, and I will instantly yeeld, that hee may doe the like to this fift. If hee cannot doe any of the former, what vanitie was it in the Cardinall and *Binius* to say of this fift, that while it was extant, and *Ens*, it was neither a general nor lawful Councell, but some one, or some twenty yeares after, when it was *non Ens*, the Pope made it, with a word, both a generall and lawfull Councell? *Dixit & factum est*: One word of his mouth makes, or unmakes what he list: Truth is, the Popes, or any other Bishops approbation, or confirmation of a Councell, or any decree thereof, after the Councell is once ended, may perhaps in the opinion of some men, gaine some more liking unto that Councell, or decree, than before it had, seeing now it hath the expresse consent of those Bishops, whom the other doe much esteeme: but the after consent, or approbation of all the Bishops in the world, much lesse of the Pope, cannot make that to bee a generall, which before, and while it was extant, was onely Provinciall; or that to be a lawfull, which before, and while it was extant, was an unlawfull Synod: Even as the Pope, and a thousand Bishops with him, cannot now make any of the foure first generall and holy Councils, to be either unlawfull or particular Synods; and yet his power is every whit as great in annihilating that which now is, as in creating that which never was a generall or a lawfull Councell.

5. Say you that the fift Councell was of no authority till the Pope approved it, and unlesse he should approve it? See how contrary the Cardinals assertion is to the consenting judgement of the whole Church. Begin we with the Church of that age: *Baronius* tells us, that both the Emperour, the Pope, *Mennas*, and other Easterne Bishops, agreed to referre the deciding of this doubt about the Three Chapters, to a generall Councell. Why did none of them reason, as the Cardinall now doth, against the Councell? Why did the Pope delude them with that pretence of a generall Councell? Why did hee not deale plainly with the Emperour and the rest, who made that agreement, and say to this effect unto them? Why will yee referre this cause to the judgement of a Councell, it cannot decide this question otherwise than my selfe shall please? If they say as I say, it shall be a Councell, a lawfull, a generall, an holy Councell: If they say the contrary to that which I affirme, though they have ten thousand millions of voyces, their Decree shall be utterly void, their assembly unlawfull, they shall neither bee, nor bee called a generall, nor a lawfull Councell, no nor a Councell neither, but onely a Conventicle, without all authoritie in the world. Had the Emperour and the Church beleev'd this doctrine, there had beene no fift Councell ever called or assembled; nay, there

Lib. 5. c. 1. m.  
c. 1. n.

there never had beene any other holy generall Councell: The Pope had beene in stead of all, and above them all. This very act then of referring the judgement in this cause to a generall Councell, witnesseth them all (even the Pope himselfe at that time) to have esteemed the sentence of the Synod to be of authority without the Popes consent, and to be of more authority, in case they should differ (as in this question they did) than the sentence of the Pope. This before the Councell was assembled.

6. At the time of the Councell, had the Church or holy Synod which represented the whole Church, beleev'd their assembly without the Pope to be no Synod, but a Conventicle; why did they at all come together after their second Session? for they were then assured by the Pope himselfe, that he would neither come, nor send any deputies unto them. Or had they beleev'd that his definitive sentence would or ought to have overswayed others, so that without his assent their judgement should be of no validity, why did they after the fift Session; once proceed to examine or determine that cause? For before the sixt day of their assembling, they received from Pope *Vigilius* his Cathedrall and *Apostolicall Constitution* in that cause, inhibiting them either to write or speak (much more judicially to define) ought contrarie to his sentence: or if they did, that he by his authority had beforehand refuted and condemned the same. Seeing notwithstanding all this well knowne unto them, they not onely continued their Synodall assemblies, but judicially defined that cause, and that quite contrary to the Popes judgement made knowne unto them; it is an evident demonstration, that the whole general Councell judg'd their assemblies both lawfull and Synodall, and their sentence of full authority, even as ample as of any generall Councell, though the Pope denied his presence to the one, and expressely signified not onely his dislike, but contradiction and condemnation of the other.

7. What can perversicacie it selfe oppose to so cleare an evidence? or what thinke you will the Cardinall or his friends reply hereunto? Will he, or can he say, that these men who thus judg'd, were heretikes? They were not. The doctrine which they maintained was wholly Catholike, consonant (as they<sup>k</sup> professe, and as in truth it was) to *Scriptures*, to *Fathers*, to the four former generall Councells. The doctrine which they oppugned, and *Vigilius* then defended, was hereticall, condemned by all the former, *Scriptures*, *Fathers*, and Councells. Heretikes then doubtless they could not be; that, like a leprosie did cleave to *Vigilius*. Will he, or can he say that they were Schismatikes? Neither is that true. For they all even then remained in the communion with the Catholike Church: yea they were by representation the true Catholike Church: I say further, they held communion even with Pope *Vigilius* himselfe, till his owne pertinacy, and wilfull obstinacie against the true faith, severed him both from them, & from the truth. In token of which communion with *Vigilius*, they earnestly entreated his presence in the Synod, they offered him the presidency therein, yea they said in expresse words unto him, before they knew his mind to defend the *Three Chapters*, *Nos vero & communicamus & unius vobiscum* *1 Sup. cap. 2. ubi 1. & seq.* *m Col. 2. p. 523.*

*biscum sumus, We all doe hold communion with you, and are united unto you.* Schismaticall then they could not be. So the judgement of these men being all Catholikes, and holding the Catholike communion, doth evidently prove the whole Catholike Church at that time, to have beleev'd a Councell to be both generall and lawfull, though the Pope dissented from it, and by his *Apostolicall* authority condemned the same, and the decree thereof.

8. After the end of the Councell did the Church then think otherwise? Did it then judge the Councell to want authority, while it wanted the Popes approbation, or to receive authority by his approbation? Who were they, I pray you, that thought thus? Certainly not Catholikes, and the condemners of these Chapters. For they approved the Councell and Decree thereof during the time of the Councell, and while the Pope so far disliked it, that for his refusall to consent unto it, he endured banishment. Neither did the Heretikes who defended those Chapters, judge thus. For they, as *Baronius* witnesseth<sup>n</sup>, *persisted in the defence of them, and in a rent from the others, even after Vigilinus had consented to the Synod: yea among them Vigilinus* *redditus est execrabilis, was even detested and accursed by them for approving the Synod.* Or because *Vigilinus* approved it not, *Pelagius* who is knowne to have approved it, was so generally disliked for that cause of the Westerne Bishops, *that there could not be found three who would lay hands on him at his consecration;* but instead of a Bishop, they were enforced against that Canon<sup>2</sup> of the Apostles, which they often oppose to us, to take a Presbyter of *Ostia* at his ordination. So much did they dislike both the first Councell, and all (though it were the Pope) who did approve it. Now the whole Church being at that time divided into these two parts, the defenders and condemners of those Chapters, seeing neither the one nor the other judged the Synod to be generall or lawfull, because the Pope approved it; who possibly could there be at that time of the Cardinals fancie, that the first Councell wanted all authority till the Pope approved it, and gained authority of a generall and lawfull Councell by his approving of it? Catholikes and condemners of those Chapters, embraced the Councell, though the Pope rejected it: Heretikes and defenders of those Chapters, rejected the Councell, though the Pope approved it. Neither of them both (and so none at all in the whole Church) judged either the Popes approbation to give, or his reprobation to take away authority from a generall Councell. Thus by the *Antecedentia*, *Concomitantia*, and *Consequentia* of the Councell, it is manifest by the judgement of the whole Church in that age, that this first Councell was of authority without the Popes approbation, and was not held of authority by reason of his approbation.

9. What the judgement of the Church was, as well in the ages preceding, as succeeding to this Councell, is evident by that which we have already declared. For we have at large shewed<sup>r</sup>, that the doctrine, faith, and judgement of this first Councell, is consonant to all former, and confirmed by all following generall Councells, till that at *Lateran* under *Leo* the tenth. Whereupon it ensueth, that this doctrine

n An. 553. nu.  
221.

o An. 555. nu. 2.

p Adeo exhortuisse visi sunt Antistites occidentales aliam post quam admittere oecumenicam Synodum, ut non potuerit Pelagius repentinè Episcopus Romæ à quibus consecraretur. Bar. ad. 556. nu. 1. q. Can. 1. & Con. Nic. can. 4.

r Sup. ca. 4. nu.  
25, 26. & seq.



doctrine which wee maintaine, and the Cardinall impugneth, (that neither the Popes approbation doth give, nor his reprobation take away authority from a Councell,) was embraced and beleevied as a Catholike truth; by the whole Catholike Church of all ages, till that *Latteran* Synod, that is, for more than 1500. yeares together.

10. And if there were not so ample testimonies in this point, yet even reason would enforce to acknowledge this truth. For if this fift Councell be of force and Synodall authority, *eo nomine*, because the Pope, to wit *Pelagius*, approved it; then by the same reason is it of no force or Synodall authority, *eo nomine*, because the Pope, to wit *Vigilius*, rejected it. If the Popes definitive and *Apostolicall* reprobation cannot take away authority from it; neither can his approbation, though *Apostolicall*, give authority unto it. Or if they say that both are true, (as indeed they are both alike true) then seeing this fift Councell is both approved by Pope *Pelagius*, and rejected by Pope *Vigilius*; it must now be held both to be wholly approved, and wholly rejected: both to be lawfull, and unlawfull: both to be a generall Councell, and no generall Councell. And the very same doome must bee given of all the thirteene Councells which follow it: They all, because they are approved by some one Pope, are approved and lawfull Councells: and because they approve this fift, which is rejected by the Pope, they are all rejected, and unlawfull Councells. Such an havocke of generall Councells doth this their assertion bring with it, and into such inextricable labyrinthes are they driven, by teaching the authority of Councells to depend on the Popes will and pleasure.

11. Now though this bee more than abundant to refute all that they can alledge against this fift Councell, yet for the more clearing of the truth, and expressing my love to this holy Councell, to which next after that at *Chalcedon*, I beare speciall affection; I will more strictly examine those two reasons which *Baronius* & *Binius* have used, of purpose to disgrace this holy Synod. The former is taken from the assembling; the later, from the decree of the Councell. It was assembled, say *Baronius* and *Binius*, *Pontifice resistente & contradicente, the Pope resisting and contradicting it*. Whence they inferre, that it was an unlawfull assembly, not gathered in Gods name. In this their reason, both the antecedent and consequence are unsound and untrue. Did Pope *Vigilius* resist this Councell, and contradict the calling or assembling thereof? What testimonie doth *Baronius* or *Binius* bring of this their so confident assertion? Truly none at all. What probabilities yet, or conjectures? Even as many. Are not these men, think you, wise & worthy disputers, who dare avouch so doubtfull matters, and that also to the disgrace of an holy, ancient, and approved Councell; and yet bring no testimonie, no probability, no conjecture, no prooffe at all of their saying? *Ipsæ dixit*, is in stead of all.

12. But what will you say if *Ipsæ dixit* will prove the quite contrarie? If both *Baronius* and *Binius* professe, that *Vigilius* did consent that this Councell should be held? Heare I pray you their own words, and then admire and detest the most vile dealing of these men. *Hanc Synodum, Vigilius autoritate pontificia indixit, saith Binius; Vigilius called*

f Sup. loc cap.  
nu. 2.

t Not. in 5. Con.  
5. Concilium.

u *Ibid.* called and appointed this Synod by his papall authority. Again<sup>e</sup>, The Emperour called this first Synod, authorisate *Vigili*, by the authority of Pope *Vigilius*. Baronius sings the same note: It was very well provided, saith he<sup>e</sup>, that this Oecumenicall Synod should be held, ex *Vigilii* Papa sententia, according to the minde and sentence of Pope *Vigilius*, who above all other men desired to have a Councell. Again<sup>e</sup>, The Emperour decreed that the Synod should be called, ex *ipsius* *Vigilii* sententia, according to the minde of *Vigilius*. And a little after; It was commendable in the Emperour, that he did labour to assemble the Synod, ex *Vigili* Papa sententia, according to the minde and sentence of Pope *Vigilius*. Neither onely did the Pope consent to have a Councell, but to have it in that very city where it was held, and where himselfe then was. Indeed at the first, the Pope was desirous<sup>e</sup> and earnest, to have it held in Sicily, or in some Westerne Citie: (even as Pope *Leo* had laboured<sup>e</sup> with *Theodosius* for the Councell which was held at *Chalcedon*.) But when *Iustinian* the Emperour would not consent<sup>b</sup> to that petition, (as neither *Theodosius* nor *Martian* would to the former of *Leo*.) *Vigilius* then, voluntari<sup>e</sup> Imperatoris libens accessit, very willingly consented to the Emperours pleasure in this matter, that the Oecumenicall Councell should be held at *Constantinople*. Say now in sadnesse, what you thinke of *Baronius* and *Binus*? Whither had they sent their wits, when they laboured to perswade this Councell to be unlawfull; because Pope *Vigilius* resisted and contradicted the assembling thereof? whereas themselves so often, so evidently, so expressly testifie, not onely that it was assembled by the consent, and according to the minde, will, pleasure, desire, authority, and sentence of the Pope; but the very chiefe a<sup>d</sup> and royalty of the summons they challenge (though falsely) to the Pope; the other, which is an act of labour and service, to be as it were the Popes Sumner or Apparitor, in bringing the Bishops together by the Popes authoritie, that, and none but that they allow to the Emperour.

13. Many other testimonies might bee produced, to declare this truth: That of *Sigonius*<sup>d</sup>: The Emperour called this Synod, *Vigili* Pontifice permittente, Pope *Vigilius* permitting him: that of *Wernerus*<sup>e</sup>; *Vigilius* iussit Concilium Constantinopoli celebrari, *Vigilius* commanded that this Councell should be held at *Constantinople*: That of *Zonaras*<sup>f</sup> and *Glicetus*<sup>g</sup>, who both affirme, that *Vigilius* was Princeps Concilij, the chiefe Bishop of the Councell: not chiefe among them that sate in the Councell, for there he was not at all: nor chiefe in making the Synodall decree, for therein he contradicted the Councell: but chiefe of all who sued to the Emperour, and procured the Councell, as being desirous of the same. But omitting the rest, the whole generall Councell, yea and the Popes owne letters, put this out of all doubt. This say<sup>h</sup> the whole Councell, even in their Synodall sentence, *Consensit in scriptis in Concilio convenire, Vigilius* under his owne hand-writing consented to come together, and be present with us in the Synod. Again<sup>e</sup>, the Legates sent from the Councell to invite *Vigilius*, said<sup>i</sup> thus unto him, Your Holinesse knoweth, quod promissistis una cum Episcopis convenire, that you have promised to come together with the other Bishops, into the Councell; and there to debate this question. *Vigilius* himselfe writ<sup>k</sup> thus to the Bishops of the Councell:

2 Optativum & frequentissime supplicii voce poposcimus eundem (contum) ad quolibet Italia locum, aut certe ad Siciliam, &c. *Vigilius* in consilio apud Bar. an. 553. nu. 36.  
a Epist. Leon. 24  
b Quod quia fieri Severinus vestra non amittit. *Vigili*. loc. cit.  
c Bin. Not. in Conc. 5. 5. Concilium.

d Lib. 20. an. 555.  
e An. 544.

f An. 12. 3. in *Iustiniano*.  
g Cui Concilio praerant Eutychius, Domnus & *Vigilius*. *Glic. annal. part.* 4. p. 379.

h Coll. 2. p. 784. a

i Coll. 2. p. 753.

k Coll. 1. p. 751. b

Councell: We knowing your desire, *prædictis postulationibus annuimus, have consented to your petitions*, that in an orderly assembly being made, wee may conferre with our united brethren about the three Chapters. I doubt not but upon such faire and undoubted records, every one will now confesse, First, that if to be gathered by the Popes consent and authority, will make a Councell lawfull, (which with them is an authentike rule) then this fift Councell is without question in this respect most lawfull: Secondly, that *Baronius* and *Binius* are shamelesse both in uttering untruths, & in reviling this holy Synod, which they would perswade to be unlawful, because it was assembled; the Pope resisting it; whereas this Councell to have beene assembled, with the consent (yea as they boast with the authority also) of Pope *Vigilius*, not onely other Writers, but the Synodall Acts, the whole generall Councell, the letters of *Vigilius*, and the expresse words of *Baronius* and *Binius* themselves doe evidently declare.

14. Come now to the Consequence. Say the Pope had resisted the assembling of this Councell; was it for this cause unlawfull, was it no generall Councell? What say you then to the second Councell, of which *Baronius* thus writeth<sup>1</sup>, It was held; *repugnante Damaso, Pope Damasus resisting the holding thereof*. Will they blot that also out of the ranke of generall, and lawfull Synods? If not, why may not this fift also bee a generall and lawfull Synod, though *Vigilius* had with tooth and naile resisted the same? Shall the peevishnesse or perversnesse of the Pope, or any Bishop hinder the assembling of a generall Councell, and so the publike peace and tranquillity of the whole Church? Open but this gappe, and there never should have been, nor ever shall be any generall Councell. The wilfulnesse of *Eusebius* Bishop of *Nicomedia*, at *Nice*; of *Iohn* Patriarch of *Antioch*, at *Ephesus*; of *Dioscorus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, at *Chalcedon*, will frustrate all those holy Councells, and make them to be neither generall nor lawfull. The saying of Cardinall *Cusanus* is worthy observing to this purpose; I beleeve, saith he<sup>m</sup>, that to be spoken not absurdly, that the Emperor himselfe, in regard of that care and custody of preserving the faith, which is committed unto him, may *præceptivè indicere Synodum*, by his Imperiall authority and command assemble a Synod, when the great danger of the Church requireth the same; *negligente aut contradicente Romano Pontifice*, the Pope either neglecting so to doe, or resisting and contradicting the doing thereof. So *Cusanus*. This was the very state and condition of the Church at this time, when the fift Councell was assembled. The whole Church had beene a long time scandalized and troubled about those Three Chapters, it was rent and divided from East to West. High time it was and necessary for *Iustinian* to see that flame quenched, although Pope *Vigilius* or any other Patriarch had never so eagerly resisted the remedie thereof.

15. Had the Cardinall pleaded against this Synod, that *Vigilius* had not beene called unto it, hee had spoken indeed to the purpose. For this is essentiall, and such as without which a Synod cannot bee generall and lawfull, that all Bishops be summoned to the Synod, and coming thither, have free access unto it, and freedome of speech, and

<sup>1</sup> An. 553. nu.  
<sup>2</sup>

m<sup>l</sup> Lib. 3. de  
Concor. ca. 15.

n<sup>l</sup> Vid. sup. ca. 1.  
nu. 6.



and judgment therein. But the Cardinall durst not take this exception against this Synod, or for *Vigilius*; for none of these to have been wanting in this Councell, is so cleare, that pertinacie it selfe cannot deny it. It was not the Pope (as they vainly boast) but the Emperour, who by his owne and Imperiall authority called this Councell, as the whole Synod even in their Synodall sentence witnesse: Wee are assembled here in this City, *iussione pijsimi Imperatoris vocati*, being called by the commandement of our most religious Emperour. His calling to have beene generall, *Nicephorus* doth expressly declare, The Emperour saith he<sup>o</sup>, assembled the first generall Councell, *Episcopis ecclesiarum omnium evocatis*, the Bishops of all Churches being called unto it: yea the Emperour was so equall in this cause, that *Binius* <sup>p</sup> testifieth of him, *Paris numeri Episcopos ex Oriente & Occidente convocavit*, that he called (in particular, and besides his generall summons, by which all without exception had free access) as many out of the West, where the defenders of those Chapters did abound; as he did out of the East, where the same Chapters were generally condemned. And yet further, *Vigilius* himselfe was by name, not onely invited, intreated, and by many reasons perswaded, but even commanded by the Emperour, and in his name, to come unto the Synod, as before we shewed. Now what freedome hee might have had in the Councell, both that offer of the Presidencie, doth shew for him in particular, and the words of the Councell spoken concerning all in generall doth declare; for when *Sabinianus* and others, who being then at *Constantinople*, were invited to the Synod, and refused to come, the synod sayd<sup>r</sup>, *It was meet that they being called should have come to the Councell, and have been partakers of all things which are here done and debated*, especially seeing both the most holy Emperour and we, *licentiam dedimus unicuique*, have granted free liberty to every one to manifest his minde in the Synod concerning the causes proposed. Seeing then he not onely might, but in his duty both to God, to the Emperour, and to the whole Church, hee ought to have come, and freely spoken his minde in this cause, his resisting the will of the Emperour, and refusing to come, doth evidently demonstrate his want of love to the truth, and dutifulnesse to the Emperour, and the Church; but it can no way impair or impeach the dignity and authority of the Councell, neither for the generality, nor for the lawfulness thereof.

16. Besides all which there is yet one thing above all the rest to be remembred; for though Pope *Vigilius* was not present in the Synod either personally, or by his Legates, but in that sort resisted to come unto it, yet he was present there by his letters of instruction, by his *Apostolicall* and *Cathedrall Constitution* which hee published as a direction what was to be judged and held in that cause of the *Three Chapters*, That Decree and Constitution he promised to send *ad Imperatorem & Synodum*, both to the Emperour and to the Synod, *quod & ingenuè prestitit*, which also he ingenuously performed as the Cardinall tells<sup>r</sup> us. That elaborate<sup>r</sup> decree, to which an whole Synod, together with the Pope subscribed, containing the Popes sentence and instruction given in this cause, *Universo<sup>r</sup> orbi Catholico cum suisque fidelibus*, not onely to the Synod

<sup>o</sup> Lib. 17. ca. 17.

<sup>p</sup> Not. in Conc.  
3. S. Concilium.

<sup>q</sup> Sup. ca. 2. nu.  
1. & 3.

<sup>r</sup> Collat. 2. pa.  
524. b.

<sup>r</sup> An. 553. nu.  
47.  
<sup>t</sup> Idem, elabora-  
vii. ibid.  
<sup>u</sup> An. eod. nu.  
48.

Synod, teaching them what they should define, but to all Christians, teaching them what they should believe, was in *confessio Episcoporum recitatum*, read and recited before all the Bishops in that Councell, as *Binius* doth assure us. This one kinde of presence in the Synod, is supplementary of all the rest, of more worth then 20. nay then 200. Legates, à laere sent from his holiness. They all may deale besides, or contrary to the Popes minde, as *Zacharias* and *Rhodoaldus* did in a Councell held about the cause of *Photius*; but this *Cathedrall* instruction is an inflexible messenger, no bribes, no perswasions, no feare, no fawour can extort from it one syllable more then his holiness by the infallible direction of his Chaire hath delivered; yea though the Pope should have beene personally present in the Synod, and face to face spoken his mind in his cause, yet could not his sudden or lesse premeditated speech have beene for weight or authority comparable to this decree, being elaborated after seven yeares ponderation of the cause, and all things in it being disposed *cum omni undiq; cautela atque diligentia*, with all diligence and circumspection, that could possibly bee used, which the Pope though absent in body, yet sent as an Oracle from heaven to be a direction to the Synod, and to supply his own absence. So many wayes is this former objection of *Baronius* vaine, and unfound, when he pretends this Councell to have beene unlawfull because the Pope resisted it, and the members assembled without their head: for neither did *Vigilius* resist their assembling, but freely and willingly consented unto it; neither was hee excluded from the Synod, but most undutifully absented himselfe from it: and though the members at that time wanted the Popes head-peece, yet they had his heart, his minde, and his *Apostolicall* direction among them, to bee a Cynosure unto them in that cause, which alone is able to supply both his personall and Legantine absence in any Councell.

17. The other objection of *Baronius* is taken from the decree of this Synod. The sentence, saith he, given by it, was *contra ipsius decretum*, against the decree of *Vigilius*, and therefore their assembly deserved not the name of a generall, no nor so much as of a private Synod, it was no Councell at all. *Cardinall Bellarmine* explains this more fully, saying, Such Councells as define matters against the Popes instruction; *Reprobata Concilia dici debent*, are to bee called or accounted, Rejected Councells; for it is all one, saith he, whether the Pope doe expressly reject and reprobate a Councell, or whether the Councell deale, *contra Pontificis sententiam*, against the Popes sentence, either of both such Councells, are rejected, and so of no authoritie at all. So *Bellarmino*. What shall we answer to the perversnesse of these men? If this rule be admitted, the Church hath for ever and inevitably lost this fift Councell, and (by their second *Nicen* collection) the sixt, the seventh, and all that follow. And I verily am perswaded, that none can possibly excuse either *Baronius*, or *Bellarmino* from this crime of expunging the fift Councell, and all which follow it, from the ranke and number of generall, or approved Councells. For it is as cleare as the sunshine at noone day, that the sentence pronounced by the fift synod was contradictory to the definition and *Cathedrall* instruction sent by Pope *Vigilius* unto them. If then

x Not. in Cone.  
y. S. Constitutii.

y An. 553. nu.  
219.

z Lib. 2. de  
Conc. ca. 11.  
S. Ac de.

then to define a cause contrary to the Popes instruction be a sure note of a Reprobate Councell, as they teach it to be; farewell for ever this fift, and all that follow it, or approve it: they are all by the rule of these two worthy Cardinals, Reprobated Councells, nay not so much as Councells, but meere Conspiracies or Conventicles.

18. Besides this, see I pray you the zeale and devotion of these men to the Catholike faith. If this Councell be for this cause a Rejected Councell, because it followed not the instructions of Pope *Vigilius* sent unto it; then it should have beene an holy, and approved Councell, if it had followed those instructions of *Vigilius*; that is, if it had condemned the Councells of *Nice*, *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*, if it had decreed *Nestorianisme* to be the Catholike faith, and Iesus Christ not to be God: for *Vigilius* by decreeing that the *Three Chapters* ought to be defended, instructed them thus to define and judge. Had they thus done, then, because they had followed the instructions of *Vigilius*, the two Cardinalls would have embraced this Councell, with both armes, have applauded, & advanced it to the skies: seeing it did not so, but contradicted the Popes *Apostolicall* instructions at this time; fie on it, it is an unlawfull, a Reprobated Councell, nay it is no Councell at all, nor of any authority. Can any with reason judge these men to be ought else then *Nestorians*, then condemned hereticks, and obstinate oppugners of all ancient holy Councells, and of the Catholike faith? See the strange diversity of judgement which is in us and them. They in their hereticall dorage on the Popes *Cathedrall infallibility*, teach this fift holy Councell to bee a reprobated synod, *eo nomine*, because it followed not the instructions of Pope *Vigilius*; we on the contrary doe constantly affirme it to bee an holy and most approved synod, *eo nomine*, because it followed not, but rejected and condemned those *Cathedrall* instructions of *Vigilius*: with us consent the sixt, seventh, and all succeeding generall Councells, till that at *Laterane*, all former holy Councells also, to all which this Councell is consonant. From them dissent all these both former and subsequent Councells; that is, the whole Catholike Church for fiftene hundred yeares and more. *Vtri creditis?* whose doctrine thinke you now is ancient, orthodoxall, and catholike? And whether had you rather with these two Cardinalls, account this fift synod an unlawfull assembly, and a reprobate Councell, because it contradicted the hereticall constitution of Pope *Vigilius*, or with such an army of witnesses, honor it for a sacred, Oecumenicall approved Councell, though it not onely wanted the approbation, but had in plaine words the *Cathedrall* Reprobation of Pope *Vigilius*.

z Si quid contra  
hec quæ statui-  
mus, à quolibet  
factum dictum  
atq; conscriptum  
est, velfuerit;  
hoc modis om-  
nibus ex autho-  
ritate sedis Apo-  
stolice resuta-  
mus. Const. Vig.  
in fine.

19. Having now fully refuted not onely the Assertion of *Baronius*, That this Councell was of no authority, nor an approved Councell till Pope *Vigilius* confirmed and approved it, but also both those reasons whereby he would perswade the same: there remaineth yet one doubt, which necessarily is to be satisfied for the finall clearing of this point. For it will, and justly may bee demanded, what it was which made this fift an approved Councell? Or if it bee not the Popes confirmation and approbation, what it is in any Councell, or any decree thereof



thereof, which makes it to be, and rightly to be esteemed an approved Councell or Decree? I constantly answer, that whatsoever it be, it is no approbation, no confirmation, nor any act of the Pope; at least no more of him, than of any other Patriarke or Patriarchall Pimate in the Church: An evident prooffe whereof is in the second Generall Councell; for that, ever since their Synodall sentence was made against the MACEDONIANS, and ratified by the Emperour, was esteemed by the Catholike Church an Oecumenicall, and approved Councell, and that, before the Pope had consented unto it or approved the same: For that Councell being assembled in May<sup>a</sup>, when *Eucherius* and *Seagrius* were Consuls, (an: 381.) continued till<sup>b</sup> about the end of *July* in the same yeare. On the 30. of *July Theodosius* the Emperour published his severe law against the *Macedonians*, being then condemned heretikes: Hee commanded that forth with all Churches should be give to those, who held the one and equall Majesty of the Father, Sonne, and Holy Ghost, and were of the same faith with *Nestorius*, *Timosheus*, and other Bishops in that Synod; but whosoever dissented in faith from them, *ut manifestos hereticos ab Ecclesia expelli, they should all be expelled as manifest heretikes, and never be admitted againe.* In which law seeing the *Macedonians* are called manifest heretikes, that is, such as are convicted and condemned by a generall Councell, it is doubtlesse, that at the promulgating of this law, both the Emperour and the catholike Church, held that decree of the second Councell, against the *Macedonians*, to be the judgment of an holy, lawful, & approved Oecumenical Synod, such as was the most ample convictiō of an heretike, & manifestation of a heresie: Now this Ediēt was published before Pope *Damasus* either approved that Councell, or so much as knew what was done therein: For the first newes what was done in the Councell, came to *Damasus*, after the Councell of *Aquileia*, as after *Sigonius*<sup>d</sup>, *Baronius* declareth, who after the Synod at *Aquileia* described, faith<sup>e</sup>, *Post hac autem, After these things done at Aquileia*, when *Damasus* had received a message concerning the Councell at *Constantinople*, &c. that Councell at *Aquileia* was held<sup>f</sup> on the first of *September*, when the other at *Constantinople* was ended a month before: and how long after that time it was before *Damasus* approved that Councell at *Constantinople*, whether one, two, or three yeares, will bee hard for any of the Cardinals friends truly to explaine: Howsoever, seeing it is certaine, that the generall Councell was ended, and the Decrees thereof not onely approved, but put in execution by the Church, before the Pope, I say not, confirmed that Councell; but before hee knew what was done and decreed therein, it is a Demonstration, that a generall Councell, or a Decree thereof, may bee, and *de facto*, hath beene judged, by the Church, both of them to bee of full and Synodall authoritie, and approved by the Church, when the Pope had confirmed or approved neither of both.

ay, what if neither *Damasus* nor any of their Popes till *Gregories* time, approved that Councell? *Gregory* himselfe is a witnesse hereof: *The Canons of the Constantinopolitane Councell condemne the Eudoxians,*

a *Socr. l. 4. ca. 8.*  
b *Vsq. ad finem mensis Iulij producta est. Bar. an. 381. nu. 80.*  
c *Lib. 3. de fide Cathol. Cod. Theod.*

d *L. 8. de Oecid. Imp. an. 381.*  
e *An. 381. nu. 97.*

f *Bar. an. eod. nu. 81.*

g *Lib. 6. Epist. 31*

doxians; but why that Eudoxius was, they doe not declare. And the Romane Church, *eosdem Canones vel gesta Synodi illius habemus non habet, nec accipit*; neither hath, nor approveth those Canons or Acts; but herein it accepteth that Synod in that which was defined against the Macedonians, by it, and it rejecteth those heresies, which being mentioned therein, were already condemned by other Fathers. So Gregory: By whose words it is plaine, that the Romane Church, untill Gregories time, neither approved the Canons nor Acts of that second generall Councell: Even the condemning of Macedonius and his heresie, was not approved by the Romane Church, *eo nomine*, because it was decreed in that Councell, for then they should have approved the Canon against the Eudoxians, and all the rest of their Canons, seeing there was the selfe same authority of the holy Councell, in decreeing them all; but the reason why they approved that against the Macedonians, was, because Pope<sup>a</sup> Damasus had, in a Romane Synod, divers yeares before<sup>b</sup> the second Councell condemned that heresie; and what heresies were by former Fathers condemned, those, and nothing else; did the Romane Church approve in that Councell, as Gregory saith. The inducement moving them was not the authority of the second Councell, but the judgement of other Fathers, for which they accepted of the second Councell therein: and this was untill the dayes or time of Gregory; for that is in which Gregory intendeth in the former words, *habemus non habet nec accipit*; not meaning, that till the yeare, wherein he writ that Epistle, which was the fifteenth Indiction, the Romane Church received not those Canons or Acts: (for in the ninth Indiction, that is, sixe yeares before, himselfe professed<sup>k</sup> to embrace that second Councell, as one of the foure Euangelists, which also to have beene the judgement of their Church, he<sup>k</sup> witnesseth in the eleventh Indiction) but untill Gregories time; *habemus*, untill this age, wherein I live, was the second Councell, the Canons or Acts thereof, not had nor approved by the Romane Church: And yet all that time, even from the end of that Councell, was both that Councell held for a generall, lawfull, and approved Synod, and their Decree against Macedonius, by the whole Church approved, as a Decree of a generall and lawfull Councell, such as ought to binde the whole Church.

21. What wee have shewed concerning the Decree against the Macedonians, and in generall, for the second Councell, that will bee much more evident in the third Canon of that Synod, which concernes the Patriarchall dignity of the See of Constantinople, his precedence to the Patriarchs of Alexandria & Antioch, and his authority over the Churches in Asia minor, Thrace, and Pontus, all which was conferred on that See by that third Canon. That the Church of Rome, till Gregories time, approved not that Canon, is evident by Pope Leo, who in many<sup>m</sup> of his Epistles, specially in that to Anatolius<sup>n</sup>, shewes his dislike of it; yea, rejects it, as contrary to the Nicene Decrees, which Leo there defineth (but, without doubt, erroneously) to bee immutable. The Legates of Leo, having intimation from him, said openly in the Councell of Chalcedon<sup>o</sup>, touching the Canons of this Councell, *in Synodici Canonibus non habentur*, they are not accounted or held

*In Anabema in  
fignibus Mace-  
donianis. Epist.  
Damas. et Sy-  
nod. Rom. apud  
Theod. lib. 5.  
ca. 10.  
i Concilium il-  
lud Romanum  
habitu est tem-  
pore Petri Episc-  
copi Alexandri-  
ni, quicui interfu-  
it. Zozom. lib. 6.  
ca. 23.  
Timotheum vero  
qui Petro succes-  
sit, sedis in Con-  
cilio Constans-  
tinopolitano,  
ut ex subscripti-  
one liquet.  
i Lib. 2. Epist. 24  
i Lib. 2. Epist. 10  
Indict. 11.*

*m Epist. 54. 97.  
61.  
n Epist. 53.*

*o Act. 16. 44.  
376.*

held for Synodall Canons; and following the minde and precept of the Pope, they most earnestly oppugned this third Canon. Long before Leo did Damasus reject this Canon, facto decreto in Synodo Romana; making a Decree against it, in a Romane Synod, which is extant in their Vaticane, as Turrian, who belike saw the Decree, doth witnesse. Now seeing that Decree of Damasus was made, statim post secundum Concilium, presently after the second Councell, and was so strongly corroborated by Pope Leo; this may perswade, that none of their Popes before the dayes of Gregory would repeale the Decrees of those two Popes. Their owne Nicholas Sanders goes further, and saith, That this Canon was not allowed by the Romane Church, till the Councell at Laterane, under Innocentius the third, which is more than sixe hundred yeares after the death of Gregory: and though he prove this by the testimony of Guillemus Tyrius, yet I insist onely upon the time of Gregorie, whose words are very pregnant for this, and the other Canons of that second Councell; the Romane Church, haecenus non habet nec accipit, did not till these dayes embrace nor approve them.

22. Now that this same third Canon was all that time, held to be of full authority, and approved by the Church, as a Canon of an holy generall Councell, which bindeth all: notwithstanding the Popes did not approve it, nay, did even by their Synodall Decrees reject it, there are very many and cleare evidences: By warrant of that Canon did Anatolius in the Councell of Chalcedon, and Eutichius in the first Synod, in the right of their See of Constantinople take place before, and above the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch; none in those Councils repining thereat: nay, those Synods, and God himselfe (as is there said) approving that precedence: And whereas this order had not beene observed in the Ephesine Latrocinie; Flavianus Bishop of Constantinople being set after the Bishops of Antioch and Iersalem, the Bishops of the Councell of Chalcedon stormed thereat, and said, Why did not Flavianus sit in his proper place? that is, next to the Romane Bishop, or his Legates. By authority of the same Canon did Chrysostome, when he was Bishop of Constantinople, depose fifteen Bishops in Asia; ordaine others in their roomes; celebrate a Councell at Ephesus, and call the Asian Bishops unto it; none of which either could he have done, or would the other have obeyed him therein, had it not beene knowne, that they were subiect to him as their Patriarke, by that Canon of the second generall Councell, to which they all must obey: And this was done about some twenty yeares after that Canon was made. So quickly was the same in force, and was acknowledged to bee of a binding authority. In the Councell of Chalcedon, when the truth of this Canon was most diligently examined, Elutherius Bishop of Chalcedon said, Sciens quia per Canones & per consuetudinem, I subscribed hereunto, knowing that the See of Constantinople hath these rights (in Asia and Pontus, as a Patriarke to governe there) both according to the Canons, and according to custome: and the like was deposed by many Bishops of Asia and Pontus. They acknowledge, nay, they knew there was such a Canon; they knew also, that the custome and practice did concurrere cum lege, did concur with the Canon; whereupon the glorious Iudges, after full discussing of this

p Sedes Apostolica quae nobis, praecepit. lib. d. pa. 137. b.  
q Vehementer resistant hunc tertium Canonem Leo et Damasus. Turrian. lib. de 6, 7, et 8, Synodis. pa. 65. Romana Ecclesia haecenus resistit hunc Canonem. Bin. not. in Conc. 25 Approbatum et iam primum (in Concilio Later.) Constantinopolitana sedes Romana Ecclesia assensum, publice obtinuit. Et. Sand. lib. 7. de visib. Monar. ad an. 1215.

f Aet. 1. et alij ubi recensentur Episcopi. Coll. 1. et alij. u Ecce nos Deo volente Anatolium primum habemus. Ait Postcasianus in Conc. Chal. Aet. 1. ca. 8. b.

x Ibid. y S. memoria Chrysostomus 15 Episcopos cepit in Asia, et pro eis alios ordinavit. Conc. Chale. Aet. 1. in fine. Zero lib. 1. ca. 6.

z Pallad. in vit. Chrys. a Conc. habitum an. 381. Chrysost. creatus Episcopus Cesario et Attico Cass. Socr. lib. 6. ca. 2. id est, circa an. 398 et hunc secundo anno, aut circiter, hac eveniunt.

b Aet. 16. pd. 136. b.



cause, testified<sup>b</sup>, and sentenced, that the Bish. of Constantinople had right full authority to ordaine Metropolitane Bishops in the Diocesses of Thrace, Asia, and Pontus, and the whole Synod consented to them; first proclaiming, *Hæc iustæssententia, this is a just sentence, this we say all*: and then in the very Synodall Epistle<sup>d</sup> to Leo testifying the same, to wit, that they had confirmed that custome to the Bishop of Constantinople, that he should ordaine Metropolitane in Thrace, Asia, and Pontus; and thereby had confirmed the third Canon of the second Councell. This was the judgement of the whole Councell at Chalcedon, that is, of the whole Catholike Church in that age, to which have consented all Councells, and catholike Bishops ever since: All these doe approve, and judge to bee approved that Canon of the second generall Councell, which the Popes and Romane Church, not onely not approved, but expressely and by Synodall decrees rejected.

23. About some ninety yeares<sup>e</sup> after this, and an hundred sixty yeares<sup>f</sup> after that second Synod, did Iustinian the Emperour confirme the 3 Canons, both of that second, and of al the former general Councells, giving unto them force of Imperiall lawes: Yea, hee further commanded those Canons, (this third among the rest) *Dipticis inseri, & pradicari, to be written in the Diptikes or Ecclesiasticall bookes, and probably to be read in the Churches, in token of the publike and universall approbation of the same*. This the fift Councell<sup>h</sup> testifieth, as also Victor<sup>i</sup>, and Evagrius<sup>k</sup>, yea, the Emperour himselfe also, who both<sup>l</sup> professeth that he will not suffer this custome to bee taken away, and signifieth<sup>m</sup> that all Patriarkes are knowne to keepe in their Diptikes, and to recite those Canons in their Churches. The Emperour doubted not but the Romane Church & Patriarke, as well as the rest, had done this, and yeilded obedience to so holy an Edi&: but the Romane Church deluded the Emperour herein: none of them, as Bellarmine<sup>n</sup> tels us, did after Iustinian time, or as he accounts after the yeare 500, *reclamare, contradict or speake against that Canon*, (which their silence the Emperour and others, not acquainted with the Romane Arts, did interpret to be a consent) but Binus<sup>o</sup> bewrayeth their policy; they, for peace and quietnes sake (being loth to exasperate the Emperour) did permit or connive at that honour conferred by the Canon upon the See of Constantinople; yet, *nunquam à Romana Ecclesia approbatum fuit; it was never*, (the not till Gregories time, which is as much as I intended to prove) *it was never, faith hee, approved by the Romane Church*; which hee proves by a Decretall of Innocentius the third; whence it is evident, seeing that Canon of the second generall Councell, was never, as Binus avoucheth, but certainly not till Gregories time, approved by the Pope, and yet was all that time approved by the catholike Church, even by the great and famous Councell at Chalcedon, & al who approve it, who are no fewer than the whole catholike Church; it is evident, I say, that it is neither the Popes Approbation which maketh, nor his Reprobation which hindereth a Councell, or any Decree, or Canon thereof, to be an approved generall Councell, or a Synodall Canon, such as doth, and ought to binde all that are in the Church.

24. The Popes Approbation it is not: but what it is which makes a generall

e Ibid.

d Relat. ad Leo.  
non post a. 16.

e Conc. Chalced.  
habitu. an. 451  
f Conc. Constant.  
habitu. an. 381.  
g Nov. 131. ca.  
1, et. 2.

h Coll. 2. pa.  
124. a.  
i In Chron. an. I.  
Iustin.  
k Lib. 4. ca. 11.  
l Cod. 1. 7. de  
summa Trin.  
m Nov. 15.

n Lib. 1. de  
Pont. ca. 24.  
o Hu.

q Not. in Conc. 2.  
S. Constantinop.

a generall Councell or Canon thereof, to be an approved Councell, or an approved Canon; and for such to bee rightly accounted, is not so easie to explaine. This in an other Treatise I have at large handled, to which, if it ever see the light, I referre my selfe; yet suffer me to touch in this place so much as may serve to cleare this, and divers other doubts, which are obvious in their writings concerning this point.

25. That every Councell and Synodall decree thereof is approved or confirmed by those Bishops who are present in that Synod, who consent upon that decree, is by the Acts of the Councells most evident. For both their consenting judgement pronounced by word of mouth, and after that, their subscription to their decree, did ratifie and confirme their sentence. In that which they call the eighth generall Synod, after the sentence pronounced, the Popes Legates said <sup>p. Act. 10.</sup> *Oportet at hac manu nostra subscribendo confirmemus*, it is needfull that wee confirme these things which we have decreed, by our subscribing unto them. Of the great Nicene Councell *Eusebius* thus writeth <sup>q. Lib. 3. de vita Constant. ca. 13.</sup>, *Those things which with one consent they had decreed, exopto in xpo, they were fully authorized, ratified, confirmed or approved*; (the Greeke word is very emphaticall) by their subscription. In the Councell of *Chalcedon*, when the agreement betwixt *Invenalis* and *Maximus* was decreed, they subscribed in this forme; That which is consented upon, *confirmo*, I by my sentence doe confirme; or, *firma esse decerno*, I decree that it shall be firme: and to the like effect subscribed all the rest. Whereupon the glorious Iudges, without expecting any other confirmation either from Pope *Leo*, or any that was absent, said; This which is consented upon shall abide firme, *in omni tempore*, for ever by our decree, and by the sentence of the Synod. Of the second generall Councell, a Synod at *Hellepont* said <sup>f. Extat inter E. pist. post Concil. Chal. pa. 168. a.</sup>, *Hanc Synodum Timotheus una cum eis praesens firmavit*, *Timotheus*, with the other Bishops then present, confirmed this Synod. The consent and subscription of the Bishops present in the Synod, they call a Confirmation of the Synod. In the Synod at *Massa*, after the sentence of the Synod was given, they all subscribed in this forme, *I. M. P. D. &c. confirmavi & subscripsi*, have confirmed this Synodall sentence, and subscribed unto it. In the second Councell at *Carthage*, held about the time of Pope *Celestine*, *Gennadius* said <sup>u. Tom. 1. Conc. pa. 541.</sup>, *Qua ab omnibus sunt dicta propria debemus subscriptione firmare*, what hath beene said and decreed by us all, wee ought by our owne subscriptions to confirme: and all the Bishops answered, *Fiat, fiat*, let us so doe; and then they subscribed. So cleare it is, that whatsoever decree is made by any Councell, the same is truly and rightly said to bee confirmed by those very Bishops who make the Decree; confirmed I say, both by their joint consent in making that Decree, and by their subscribing unto it when it is made.

26. Vpon this confirmation or approbation of any Decree by the Bishops present in the Councell, doth the whole strength and authority of any Synodall decree rely; and upon no other confirmation of any Bishop whatsoever, when the Councell is generall and lawfull. For in such a Councell, lawfully called, lawfully governed, and lawfully proceeding, as well in the free discussing, as free sentencing of the cause; there is in true account the joynt consent of all Bishops and

Ecclesiasticall persons in the whole world. No Bishop can then complaine that either he is not called, or not admitted with freedome into such a Councell, unlesse that he be excommunicated, or suspended, or for some such like reason justly debarred. If all do come, they may and doe freely deliver their owne judgement; and that not onely for themselves, but for all the Presbyters in their whole Diocesse. For seeing the pastorall care of every Diocesse, even from the Apostles time, and by them is committed to the Bishop thereof, (all the rest being by him admitted but onely into a part of his care, and to assist him in some parts of his Episcopall function) he doth, at least (because he should) he is supposed to admit none, but such as hee knoweth to professe the same faith with himselfe: whence it is, that in his voice is included the judgement of his whole Diocesane Church, and of all the Presbyters therein: they all beleiving as he doth, speake also in the Councell by his mouth, the same that he doth. If some of the Bishops come not personally, but either depute others in their rooines, or passe their suffrage (as often they did) in the voice of their Metropolitans, then their consent is expressed in theirs, whom they put in trust to be their agents at that time. If any negligently absent themselves, neither personally, nor yet by delegates signifying their minde, these are supposed to give a tacit consent unto the judgement which is given by them who are present; whom the others are supposed to thinke not onely to be able and sufficient without themselves to define that cause; but that they will define it in such sort as themselves doe wish and desire: for otherwise they would have afforded their presence, or at least sent some deputies to assist them in so great and necessary a service. If any out of stomack or hatred to the truth, do wilfully refuse to come, because they dissent from the others in that doctrine, yet even these also are in the eye of reason supposed to give an implicit consent unto that which is decreed, yea though *explicite* they doe dissent from it. For every one doth, and in reason is supposed to consent on this generall point, that a Synodall judgement must bee given in that doubt & controversie, there being no better nor higher humane Court than is that of a generall Councell, by which they may bee directed. Now because there never possibly could any Synodall judgement be given, if the wilfull absence of one or a few should bee a just barre to their sentence; therefore all in reason are thought to consent that the judgement must be given by those who will come, or who do come to the Councell, and that their decree or sentence shall stand for the judgement of a generall Councell, notwithstanding their absence who wilfully refuse to come.

27. If then all the Bishops present in the Councell do consent upon any decree, there is in it one of those wayes which we have mentioned, either by personall declaration, or by signification made by their delegates and agents, or by a tacit, or by an implicit consent, the consenting judgement of all the Bishops and Presbyters in the whole Church, that is, of all who either have judicatory power or authoritie to preach publickly; and therefore such a decree is as fully authorized, confirmed, and approved, as if all the Bishops and Presbyters in the world



world had personally subscribed in this manner, I confirme this Decree. Hereof there is a worthy example in the third generall Councell. No Presbyters at all were therein, nor in their owne right. Very many Bishops were personally absent, and present onely by their Legates or Agents; as almost all the Western Bishops, and by name Celestine Patriarch of Rome. Some, no question, upon other occasions neglected that businesse; as, it may be, the Bishops of Gangra, and of Heraclea in Macedonia, who were not at this Councell. Divers others wilfully and obstinately refused to come to that holy Synod; as by name Nestorius Patriarch of Constantinople, Iohn Patriarch of Antioch, and some forty Bishops, who at the same time while the holy Councell was held in the Church at Ephesus, held a Conventicle by themselves in an Inne, in the same Citie; and yet notwithstanding the personall absence of the first, the negligent of the second, and wilfull absence of the last, the holy<sup>x</sup> generall Councell saith of their Synodall judgement, given by those who were then present, that it was  *nihil aliud quam communis & concors terrarum orbis sensus & consensus*, nothing else but the common and consenting judgment of the whole world. How could this be, when so many Bishops, besides three Patriarchs, were either personally, or negligently, or wilfully absent? How was there in that decree the consent of these? Truly because they all (even all the Bishops in the world) did either personally, or by their Agents, expresse; or else in such a tacit and implicit manner (as wee declared) wrap up their judgement in the Synodall decree made by the Bishops present in the Councell.

<sup>x</sup> Epist. Conc. Ephes. ad Imper. tom. 2. Act. Conc. Ephes. epist. 17.

28. But what if many of those who are present, doe dissent from that which the rest being the greater part doe decree? Truly, even these also doe *implicit*, and are in reason to bee judged to consent to that same decree. For every one is supposed to agree on that generall Maxime of reason, that in such an assembly of Iudges, what the greater part decreeth shall stand as the Act and Iudgement of the whole: seeing otherwise it would be impossible that such a multitude of Bishops should ever give any judgement in a cause, for still some in perverseness and pertinacie would dissent. Seeing then it is the ordinance of God that the Church shall judge, and seeing there can no other meanes be devised how they should judge, unlesse the sentence of the greater part may stand for their judgement, reason enforceth all to consent upon this Maxime. Vpon this is that Imperiall Law grounded, *Quod maior pars curie effecit, pro rato habetur, ac si omnes id egerint*, what the greater part of the Court shall do, that is ratified, or to stand for the judgement of the Court, as if all had done the same. And againe, *Refertur ad universos quod publice fit per maiorem partem*: That is accounted the Act of all, which is publicly done by the greater part. Vpon this ground is that truly said by Bellarmine<sup>a</sup>, That whereon the greater part doth consent, *est verum decretum Concilij*, is the true decree of the Councell, even of the whole Councell. Vpon the equitie of this rule was it said in the Councell at Chalcedon<sup>b</sup>, when ten Bishops dissented from the rest, *Non est iustum decem audiri*, It is not just that the sentence of ten should prevail against a thousand and two hundred Bishops. Vpon the equitie of the

major pars

<sup>y</sup> Dig. lib. 50. l. 2.

<sup>z</sup> Dig. lib. 4. l. 1. c. 17. de Reg. Iuris 160.

<sup>a</sup> Lib. 2. de Conc. ca. 11. S. Al.

<sup>b</sup> Act. 4. p. 90. b.

<sup>c</sup> Coll. 6. p. 576. b the same rule did the fifth generall Councell truly & constantly judge, that the Councell of Chalcedon even in that definition of faith, which they all with one consent agreed upon, condemned the Epistle of Ibas as hereticall; although they knew that Maximus, with Pascasinus, and the other Legats of Pope Leo, in the Councell of Chalcedon, adjudged that Epistle to be orthodoxall. How was it the consenting judgement of the whole Councell of Chalcedon, when yet some did expresse their dissent therein? How, but by that implicit consent which all give to that rule of reason, that the judgement of the greater part shall stand for the judgement of the whole; which the fifth Councell doth plainly signifie, saying<sup>a</sup>, In Councels we must not attend the interloquutions of one or two, but what is defined in common, *ab omnibus, aut amplioribus*, either by all, or by the greater part: to that we must attend as to the judgement of the whole Councell. But omitting all the rest, there is one example in the Councell of Chalcedon most pregnant to this purpose.

<sup>e</sup> Hec omnes di-  
cimus, hoc omni-  
bus placuit. Añ.  
16. pa. 137. a. 29. All the Councell, save onely the Popes Legates, consented upon that third Canon, decreed in the second, and now confirmed in this fourth Councell, that the See of Constantinople should have Patriarchall dignity over Thrace, Asia, and Pontus, and have precedence before other Patriarches, as the next after the Bishop of Rome. The Legates following the instructions of Leo, were so averse in this matter, that they said<sup>f</sup> not without some choler, *Contradictio nostra his gestis inhæreat*, Let our contradiction cleave to these Acts: and so it doth, to the eternall disgrace both of them and their master. The glorious Iudges notwithstanding this dissenting of the Legates and of Pope Leo himselfe in them, said<sup>g</sup> concerning that Canon, That which we have spoken, (that the See of Constantinople ought to be the second, &c.) *Tota Synodus, the whole Councell hath approved it*. Why, but the Popes Legates approved it not; they contradicted it. True, in this particular they dissented. But because they as all other Bishops, even Pope Leo himselfe, consented unto that generall Maxime, That the judgement of the greater part shall stand for the judgement of the whole Councell, in that generall both the Legats of Leo, and Leo himselfe, did *implicitè* and virtually consent to that very Canon, from which actually and *explicitè* they did then dissent. For which cause the most prudent Iudges truly said, *Tota Synodus, the whole Councell hath approved this Canon*: either *explicitè* or *implicitè*, either expressly or virtually approved it. Neither did onely those secular Iudges so esteeme, the whole generall Councell it selfe professed the same, and that even in the Synodall Relation of their Acts to Pope Leo: The universall<sup>h</sup> Synod said thus, *We have condemned Dioscorus, we have confirmed the faith, we have confirmed the Canon of the second Councell for the honour of the See of Constantinople, we have condemned the heresie of Eutyches*: Thus writ the whole Councell to Leo: declaring evidently that act of approving that Canon to be the Act of the whole Synod, although they knew the contradiction of the Pope and his Legates to cleave unto it.

30. You see now that in every sentence of a generall and lawfull Councell there is an assent of all Bishops and Presbyters, they all either *explicitè*, or *tacitè*, or *implicitè*, consenting to that decree, whether

<sup>h</sup> Sancta & universal Synod. Leon. Relat. Synod. post Act. 16

ther they be absent or present, and whether in that particular they consent or dissent. Now because there can bee no greater humane judgement in any cause of faith or ecclesiasticall matter, than is the consenting judgement of all Bishops and Presbyters, that is, of all who have power either to teach or judge in those causes; it hence clearly ensueth, that there neither is nor can be any Episcopall or Ecclesiasticall confirmation or approbation whatsoever of any decree, greater, stronger, or of more authority, then is the judgement it selfe of such a generall Councell, and their owne confirmation or approbation of the decrees which they make; for in every such decree there is the consent of all the Bishops and Presbyters in the whole world.

31. Besides this confirmation of any synodall decree, which is by Bishops, and therefore to bee called *Episcopall*, there is also another confirmation added by Kings and Emperors, which is called *Royall* or *Imperiall*; by this later, religious Kings not onely give freedom and liberty, that those decrees of the Councell shall stand in force of Ecclesiasticall Canons within their dominions, so that the contemners of them may be with allowance of Kings, corrected by Ecclesiasticall censures, but further also, doe so strengthen, and backe the same by their sword, and civill authority, that the contradicters of those decrees, are made liable to those temporall punishments, which are set downe in *Ezra*<sup>1</sup>, to death, to banishment, to confiscation of goods, or to imprisonment, as the quality of the offence shall require, and the wisdom of that Imperiall State shall think fit. Betwixt these two confirmations, *Episcopall* and *Imperiall*, there is exceeding great oddes and difference. By the former, judicall sentence is given, and the synodall decree made or declared to be made; for which cause it may rightly be called a judicall or definitive confirmation: by the later, neither is the synodall decree made, nor any judgment given to define that cause (for neither Princes nor any Lay men, are Iudges to decide those matters, as the Emperours *Theodosius* and *Valentinian* excellently declare in their directions to *Candidianus*, in the Councell of *Ephesus*;) but the synodall decree being already made by the Bishops, and their judgement given in that cause, is strengthened by Imperiall authority, for which cause, this may fitly be called a supereminēt or corroborative confirmation of the synodall judgement. The former confirmation is *Directive*, teaching what all are to beleve or observe in the Church: the later is *Coactive*, compelling all, by civill punishment to beleve or observe the Synodall directions. The former is *Essentiall* to the Decree, such as if it want, there is no Synodall decree made at all: the later is *Accidentall*, which though it want, yet is the Decree of the Councell, a true Synodall Decree and sentence. The former bindes all men to obedience to that Decree, but yet onely under paine of Ecclesiasticall censures: the latter bindes the subjects only of those Princes, who give the Royall Confirmation to such Decrees, and binds them under the pain only of temporal punishment. By vertue of the former, the contradicters or contemners of those Decrees are tightly to be accounted either heretikes in causes of faith, or contumacious in other matters, and such are truly subject to the censures of the

*Episcopall* & *Imperiall*  
all Confirmations.

i Ez. 7. 16.

k Nefas est enim  
qui Episcoporum  
catalogo adscrip-  
tus non est, Ec-  
clesiasticis nega-  
tis se immiscere.  
(neque ut iudi-  
cā qui desinit.)  
Epist. Imp. ad  
Synod. Ephes. 10.  
1. Ad Ephef.  
conc. ca. 32.



the Church, though, if the later be wanting, those censures cannot bee inflicted by any, or upon any, but with danger to incurre the indignation of Princes: By vertue of the later, not onely the Church may safely, yea, with great allowance and praise, inflict their Ecclesiasticall censures, but inferiour Magistrates also may, nay ought to proceed against such contemners of those Synodall decrees, as against notorious, convicted, and condemned heretikes; or in causes which are not of faith, but of externall discipline and orders, as against contumacious persons. The Episcopall confirmation is the first in order, but yet because it proceeds from those who are all subiect to Imperiall authority, it is in dignitie *inferiour*. The Imperiall confirmation is the last in order, but because it proceeds from those to whom everie soule is subiect, it is in dignity *Supreme*.

32. This Imperiall confirmation, as holy generall Councils did with all submission intreate of Emperours, so religious Emperours did with all willingnesse grant unto them. Of the great *Nicene* Councell *Eusebius* saith<sup>1</sup>, *Constantine* sealed, ratified, and confirmed the decrees which were made therein. The second general Councell writ<sup>m</sup> thus to the Emperour *Theodosius*, *We beseech your clemency, that by your letters, ratum esse jubas confirmesque Concilij decretum, that you would ratifie and confirme the decree of this Councell*: and that the Emperour did so, his Imperiall Edi&th, before<sup>a</sup> mentioned, doth make evident. To the third Councell the Emperour writ thus<sup>o</sup>, *Let matters concerning religion and piety be diligently examined, contention being laid aside; ac tum demum nostra pietate confirmationem expectate; and then expect from us our imperiall confirmation*. The holy Councell having done so, writ<sup>p</sup> thus to the Emperour, *We earnestly intreate your piety, ut jubeat ea omnia, that you would command, that all which is done by this holy and Oecumenical Councell against Nestorius, may stand in force; per vestra pietatis nutum et consensum confirmata, being confirmed by your roall assent*: And that the Emperour yielded to their request, his Edi&th against *Nestorius* doth declare. In the fourth Councell the Emperour said<sup>r</sup>, *We come to this Synod, not to shew our power, sed ad confirmandam fidem, but to confirme the faith*. And whē he had signified before all the Bishops his royall assent<sup>t</sup> to their decree, the whole Councell cryed out, *Orthodoxam fidem tu confirmasti; thou hast confirmed the Catholike faith*: often ingeminating those joyfull acclamations. That *Iustinian* confirmed the fift Councell, his imperiall Edi&th for condemning those *Three Chapters*, which after the Synodall judgment stood in more force than before; his severity<sup>t</sup> in punishing the contradicters of the Synodall sentence, partly by exile, partly by imprisonment, are cleare witnesses. The sixt Councell said<sup>u</sup> thus to the Emperour, *O our most gracions Lord grant this favour unto us, signaculum tribue, seale and ratifie all that we have done; vestram inscribito imperialem ratihabitionem; addē unto them your imperiall confirmation, that by your holy Edi&ths, and godly constitutions they may stand in firme force*. And the Emperour upon their humble request, set forth his Edi&th, wherein he saith<sup>x</sup>, *We have published this our Edi&th, that we might, corroborare atque confirmare ea qua definita sunt, corroborate and confirme those things which are defined by the Councell*. To all which, that may bee added which

<sup>1</sup> Lib. 4. de vita  
Constant. ca. 27.  
<sup>m</sup> Epist. Synod.  
2. post A&th.  
Concil. pa. 518.

<sup>n</sup> Hoc. ep. mu.  
19.  
<sup>o</sup> A&th Ephef.  
Conc. 10. n. 3.  
ca. 17.  
<sup>p</sup> A&th. Conc.  
Eph. 10. 4. ca. 8.

<sup>q</sup> Imperator sen-  
tentia Synodi  
publicē approba-  
ta, Nestorio ex-  
ilium indicit.  
A&th. Con. Eph. 10.  
5. ca. 11. et lege  
ult. de heret.  
Cod. Theod.  
1 A&th. 6.  
<sup>r</sup> In perpetuum  
que a vobis ter-  
minata sunt ser-  
ventur. Ibid.  
<sup>s</sup> Vid. in Chron.  
an. post Const. Bas.  
73. 14. 15. &c.  
<sup>u</sup> A&th. 18.  
<sup>x</sup> Edi&th. Constat.  
Pogon. A&th. 18.  
Conc. 6.

which *Basilian* the Emperour said in the eighth Synod, as they call it; *I had purposed to have subscribed after all the Bishops, as did my predecessors, Constantine the great, Theodosius, Martian, and the rest*: thereby evidently testifying, not onely the custome of imperiall confirmation to have been observed in all former Councells, but the difference also betwixt it and the Episcopall subscription; the Bishops first subscribing, and thereby making or declaring, that they had made a Synodall decree; the Emperours after them all subscribing, as ratifying by their Imperiall confirmation what the Bishops had decreed.

33. By this now it fully appeareth, what it is which maketh any Synod or any Synodall decree, to be, and justly to be accounted an approved Synod; or an approved Synodall and Oecumenicall decree. It is not the Popes assent, approbation, or confirmation, (as they, without all ground of truth doe fancy,) which at any time did, or possibly can doe this. It is onely the Vniversall and Oecumenicall consent of the whole Church, and of all the members thereof, upon any decree made by a generall Councell, which truly makes that an approved decree, which generall and Oecumenicall consent or approbation, is shewed partly by the Episcopall confirmation of that decree, made by the Bishops present therein, wherein there is ever either an expresse, or a vertuall and implicite consent of all the Bishops and Presbyters, and so of all the Clergy in the world; partly by the royall and imperiall confirmation given to that decree by Christian Kings and Emperours, in which there is an implicite consent of all Laickes in the whole Church, Kings and Princes assenting not onely for themselves, but in the name of all their Lay subjects, for whom they undertake, that either they shall willingly obey that decree, or else by severity of punishments, be compelled thereunto. If these two confirmations, or either of them be wanting, the Councell and decree which is supposed to be made therein, is neither an approved or confirmed Councell, nor decree, though the Pope send forth ten thousand Bulls to approve and confirme the same: But if these two confirmations concur in any decree of a generall and lawfull Councell, though the Pope reprobate and reject that Councell or decree never so often, yet is both that Councell an approved generall Councell; and the decree thereof an approved or confirmed Synodall and Oecumenicall decree, approved I say, and confirmed by the greatest humane authority and judgement that possibly can bee, either found, or desired, even by the whole catholike Church, and every member, whether Ecclesiasticall or Laicall, therein: And whosoever after such an ample approbation or confirmation, shall at any time contradict or contemne such a Councell or decree, he doth not, nor can he thereby impaire the dignity and authority of it, but he demonstrates himselfe to be an heretike, or, at least, a contumacious person, insolently, and in the pride of his singularity despising that judgement of the Councell, which the whole Church, and every member thereof, yea, even himselfe also among them, hath approved.

34. You will yet demand of mee, why generall Councells have sought the Popes approbation and confirmation of their decrees, (as did

z. Rogamus tuis  
decreis nostrum  
bonum iudici-  
um. Epist. Synod.  
Chal. ad Leonem  
post Act. 16.  
a Statuerunt  
318. Patrum fi-  
dem firmam ac  
stabilem manere  
oportere. Cons.  
Const. ca. 1.  
b In definit. fidei  
Act. 5. Confir-  
mavimus Pa-  
trum 150. regu-  
lam Epist. Conc.  
Chal. ad Leonē  
post Act. 16.  
Conc. Chal. prae-  
dicta concilia  
firmavit.  
Epist. Episc.  
Europe post Conc.  
Chal pa. 151.

d Not. in Conc.  
Rom. 3. tempore  
Silvestri.  
e Bin. not. in  
Conc. (Chal.  
§ Incipunt pa.  
190.  
f Epist. 73. hoc  
classico Pontifi-  
ci Imperator  
excitatus (sancti-  
onem edidit.  
Bin. not. in eam  
Epist.  
in Locis citatis.  
m Pa. 146. ad  
pa. 179.  
o Pa. 166.  
p Vi liquet ex  
eorum epist. Sy-  
nod. qua extat  
post Epist. 52.  
Leonis.  
q Vi Epist. Syria  
post Conc. Chal.  
pa. 155. b.  
r Vi Epist. Alex-  
sina ibid. a.  
s Vi Epist. secun-  
da Syria. ibid.  
pa. 157. b.  
t Vi Epist. Orie-  
ntis. ibid. pa.  
168. a.

did the Councell of Chalcedon<sup>a</sup> of Pope Leo) after the end of the Synods, and what effect or fruit did arise from such confirmations, if it added no greater authority to the Synodall sentence, than before it had? I also aske of you another question; Why did the Councell of Constantinople confirme<sup>a</sup> the Nicene Synod, and the faith decreed therein? or why did the Councell of Chalcedon confirme<sup>b</sup> all the three former generall Councils? or why did their second Nicene confirme all the fixe Synods which were before it, saying<sup>c</sup>, *Eorum constitutionem integram & illabescibilem confirmamus*; we confirme the divine Canons and constitutions, being inviolable? Was not the great Nicene Councell and decree of faith, of as great authority before it was confirmed by the second or fourth Council, as afterwards? or what greater strength and authority had either it, or any of the fixe first generall Councils, by the confirmation of the second Nicene Synod, which, unto all the former, is as much inferiour, as is drosse or clay to the gold of Ophir. If the confirmations of one generall Council by another, give no greater authority unto it than before it had, (it is certain by these examples, that it doth not) what marvell if the Popes confirmation doe not worke that effect? If notwithstanding all this, the confirmations of former, by subsequent Councils, bee not fruitlesse, truly, neither the confirmation of the Pope, or any other Bishop that is absent, must bee thought fruitlesse, though it adde no more authority to the Synod, or Synodall decrees, than before they had.

35. Neither did only general, but even Provincial Coucels, yea, particular Bishops confirme generall Synods, and the decrees thereof. The Synod at Millane was assembled by the direction of Pope Leo, in which the Acts of the first Ephesine Councell, *per subscriptionem Episcoporum absentium sunt confirmata*; were confirmed by the subscription of those Bishops, who were absent. So writeth<sup>d</sup> Binius. The like was done after the Councell of Chalcedon; for when some began to quarrell at it, Leo the Emperour, that he might, *confirmare<sup>e</sup> ea*, confirme the decrees of that Councell, published an Edict to that end, at the sollicitation of Pope Leo<sup>f</sup>; yea further; the Emperour commanded the severall Bishops to shew their judgements in that doctrine of faith decreed at Chalcedon, which he did to this end; *ut omnium calculo & confessione Chalcedonense Concilium iterum firmaretur*, saith Binius<sup>g</sup>; that the Councell of Chalcedon might be confirmed againe by the consent and confession of all those Bishops. They did what the Emperour commanded them: some alone, as Anatolius; Sebastianus; Lucianus; Agapetus, and many moe; some in Synodall Epistles, as the Bishops of Alexandria, of Europe; all whose letters are adjoynt to the Councell of Chalcedon<sup>h</sup>: concerning all which, that is to be noted which Agapetus saith<sup>i</sup>, *Pene omnes occidentalium partium Episcopi confirmaverunt, atque consignaverunt*; almost all the Bishops of the West, (and so also in the East) did confirme by their letters and subscriptions, that faith which was explained at Chalcedon. What authority thinke you, could the confirmation of one single Bishop, as of Agapetus and Sebastianus, or of a Synod consisting but of nineteene Bishops, (as that at Millan<sup>j</sup>) or but of seven<sup>k</sup>, or fixe<sup>l</sup>, or five<sup>m</sup>, or foure<sup>n</sup>, (as some of the other) give to the great and Occumenicall Councils of Ephesus



*Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*, approved not onely by the Popes, but by the consenting judgement of the whole (Christian) world, as out of the *Ephesine* Synod we before declared: And yet was never one of those confirmations fruitlesse, as Pope *Leo*, who was the author of them, rightly judged. Of the great *Nicene* Councell, *Eusebius* Bishop of *Nicomedia*, and *Theognis* Bishop of *Nice*, after they had endured exile for not consenting to the *Nicene* faith, in token of their repentance, writ thus unto the Synod, *Those things which are decreed by your judgement, consentientibus animis confirmare decrevimus, we are purposed to confirm with consenting mindes.* Even the consent of two, and those exiled and hereticall Bishops, is called a confirmation of the great *Nicene* Councell, to which no authority was added therby. I will but add one example more; and that is of this our fift Councell, concerning which, in their second *Nicene* Synod, it is thus said \*, *Four Patriarkes being present, approved the same, and the most religious Emperour sent the Synodall Acts thereof to Ierusalem;* where a Synod being assembled, all the Bishops of *Palestina*, *manibus, & pedibus, & ore, sententiam Synodi confirmarunt;* they all confirmed the sentence of this Councell, with their hands, with their confessions, and full consent, except onely one *Alexander* Bishop of *Abyles*, who thought the contrary, and therefore was put from his Bishopricke; and comming to *Constantinople* was swallowed up by an earthquake. So their *Nicene* Synod: By all which it is now cleare, that generall and approved Oecumenicall Councils, or the decrees thereof, may bee, and, *de facto*, have bene usually approved and confirmed not onely by the Pope, but by other succeeding generall Councils, by Provinciall Synods, yea, by particular Bishops, who have bene absent, none of all which gave, or could give more authority to the Councell or Synodall decree thereof, than it had before; and some of them are both in authority and dignity not once to bee compared to those Synods which they doe approve or confirme; and yet not any one of al these confirmations were needlesse, or fruitlesse.

36. The reason of all which may be perceived by the divers ends of those two confirmations. These use & end of the first confirmation by the Bishops present in the Councell, was judicially to determine and define the controversie then proposed, and to give unto it the full and perfect authority of a Synodall Oecumenicall decree, that is in truth, the whole strength and authority which all the Bishops and Churches in the whole world could give unto it. The use and end of the second confirmation by those Bishops, who were absent, was not judicially to define that cause, or give any judgment therein, (for this was done already, and in as effectually a manner as possible it could bee) but to preserve the peace of the Church, and unity in faith, which could by no other meanes be better effected, than if Bishops, who had been absent, and therefore did but *implicitè*, or by others, consent to those decrees at the making thereof, did afterwards declare their owne explicate and expresse consent to the same. Now because the more eminent that any Bishop was, either for authority or learning, the more likely he was, either to make a rent and schisme in the Church, if hee should dissent; or to procure the tranquility and peace of the

u *Epistola eorum extat apud Synodalem lib. 1. ca. 10.*

x *Act. 1. pa. 306*

y Sacra Imper.  
ad Iohan. 10. 5.  
Act. Eph. Conc.  
ca. 3. Cyril. Epist.  
38. ad Dynatum  
10. cod. ca. 16.

Church, if hee should consent; hence it was, that if any Patriarke, Patriarchall Primate, or other eminent Bishop were absent at the time of the Councell, the Church and Councell did the more earnestly labour to have his expresse consent and confirmation to the Synodall decrees: This was the cause why both the religious Emperour *Theodosius*, and *Cyrill*, with other orthodoxall Bishops, were so earnest to have *Iohn* Patriarke of *Antioch*, to consent to the holy *Ephesine* Synod, which long before was ended; that as he had beene the ringleader to the factious conventicle, and those who defended *Nestorius* with his heresie; so his yeelding to the truth, and embracing the Ephesine Councell, which condemned *Nestorius*, might draw many others to doe the like, and so indeed it did. This was the principall reason why some of the ancient Councils, as that by name of *Chalcedon*, (for all did it not) sought the Popes confirmation to their Synodall decrees; not thinking their sentence in any cause to bee invalid, or their Councell no approved Councell, if it wanted his approbation or confirmation, (a fancy not dreamed of in the Church in those daies) but whereas the Pope was never personally present in any of those w<sup>ch</sup> they account the 8 general Councils, the Synod thought it fit to procure, if they could, his expresse and explicate consent to their decrees, that he being the chiefe Patriarch in the Church, might by his example move all, and by his authoritie draw his owne Patriarchall Diocese (as usually hee did) to consent to the same decrees; whereas, if he should happen to dissent (as *Vigilius* did at the time of the fift Councell) hee was likely to cause (as *Vigilius* then did) a very grievous rent and schisme in the Church of God.

37. There was yet another use and end of those subsequent confirmations, whether by succeeding Councils, or absent Bishops: and that was, that every one should thereby either testifie his orthodoxy in the faith, or else manifest himselfe to bee an heretike: For as the approving of the six generall Councils, and their decrees of faith did witnesse one to be a Catholike in those doctrines; so the very refusing to approve or confirme any one of those Councils, or their decrees of faith, was *ipso facto*, without any further examination of the cause, an evident conviction that he was a condemned heretike; such an one, as in the pride and pertinacie of his heart rejected that holy synodall judgement, which all the whole catholike Church, and every member thereof, even himselfe also had *implicitè* before confirmed and approved. In which respect an heretike may truly bee called *ἀντιπαραχρηστος*, being convicted and condemned not onely by the evidence of truth, and by synodall sentence, but even by that judgment which his owne selfe had given *implicitè*, in the decree of the Councell. The summe is this; The former confirmation by the Bishops present in the Synod, is *Iudiciall*; the later confirmation by the Bishops who are absent, is *Pacificall*. The former is *authoritative*, such as gives the whole authority to any decree: the later (whether by succeeding Councils, or absent Bishops) is *Testificative*, such as witnesseth them to be orthodoxall in that decree. The former, joyned to the Imperiall confirmation, is *Essentiall*, which essentially makes both the Councell,

cell an approved Councell, & all the decrees thereof, approved, synodal, and Oecumenicall decrees: the later is *accidental*, which being granted by a Bishop, doth much grace himsele, but little or nothing the Synod; and being denyed by any, doth no whit at all either disgrace the Synod, or impare the dignity and authority thereof, but doth extremely disgrace the partie himsele who denyeth it, and puls downe upon him, both the just censures of the Church, and those civill punishments which are due to heretikes or contumacious persons.

38. My conclusion now is this: Seeing this fift Councell was both for the calling generall, and for the proceeding therein lawfull, and orderly; and seeing, although it wanted the Popes consent, yet it had the concurrence of those two confirmations, before mentioned; *Episcopall* and *Imperiall*, in which is included the Oecumenicall approbation of the whole catholike Church: it hence therefore ensueth, that as from the first assembling of the Bishops it was an holy, a lawfull, and Oecumenicall Councell, so from the first pronouncing of their synodall sentence, and the Imperiall assent added thereunto; it was an approved generall Councell, approved by the whole catholike Church; and so approved, that without any expresse consent of the Pope added unto it, it was of as great worth, dignity, and authority, as if all the Popes since *S. Peters* time had, with their owne hands subscribed unto it. And this may suffice to satisfie the fourth and last exception which *Baronius* devised to excuse *Vigilius* from heresie.

C A P. XIX.

The true notes to know which are generall and lawfull, and which either are not generall, or being generall, are not lawfull Councils; with divers examples of both kinds.



**I** H A T which hath bene said in the former Chapter is sufficient to refute that cavill of *Baronius*, against the fift Councell, whereby he pretends it to have neither been a generall, nor a lawfull Synod; because the Pope resisted the assembling, and contradicted the decree and sentence thereof; but for as much as it is not victory, but truth which I seeke, and the full satisfaction of the reader in this cause, and seeing this point about the lawfulnessse of generall Councils, is frequent, and very obvious, and such as being rightly conceived, will give great light to this whole controversie about Councils, I will crave liberty to lanch somewhat further into this deepe, and explaine, with what convenient brevity I can, what it is which maketh any Synod to bee, or rightly to be esteemed a generall and lawfull Councell.

1. As the name of *Synod* doth in his primary and large acception agree to every assembly, so doth the name of Councell to every assembly of consultation: The former being derived from *synagoge*,



*h Concilium di-  
ctū à communi  
intentione, eo  
quod in unum  
omnes dirigant  
mentis obtutū :  
Cilia enim ocu-  
lorum sunt. Iſod.  
Mer. in ſuam  
Canon. collect.*

isall one with *Cetus*, and imports the assembly of any multitude which meeteth and commeth together : The later being derived of *Cilia*<sup>a</sup>, (whence also *supercilium*) imports the common or joynt intending, or bending their eyes, both of body and minde, to the investigation of the truth in that matter, which is proposed in their assembly : But both of those words being now drawne from those their large and primitive significations, are by Ecclesiasticall writers, and use of speech, (*penes quem ius est, & norma loquendi*) restrained and appropriated onely to those assemblies of Bishops, and Ecclesiasticall persons, wherein they come together to consult of such matters as concernes either the faith or discipline of the Church. Of these, because some are lawfull, others unlawfull Synods, if we can finde what it is which maketh a generall and lawfull Councell, it will bee easie therby to discern which are unlawfull Synods, seeing it is vulgarly and truly said, that, *Rectum is index sui & obliqui*.

3. That a Synod be generall and lawfull, there are three things necessarily, and even essentially required, the want of any one of which is a just barre and exception, why that Synod is either not generall, or not lawfull. The first, which concernes the generalitie, is, that the calling and summons to the Councell be generall and Oecumenicall, so that all Bishops be called, and when they are come, have free access to the same Councell, unlesse for some fault of their owne, or some just reason, they ought to bee debarred : For if the calling to any Synod bee out of some parts onely of the Church, and not out of the whole, the judgement also of such a Councell is but partiall, not generall, and the Councell is but particular, not Oecumenicall, seeing some of those who have judicatory power are either omitted, or unjustly excluded from the Synod. The want of this was a just exception taken by the Pope *Iulius*, against that Councell of *Antioch*<sup>b</sup>, (wherein *Athanasius* was deposed by the *Arian* faction, and *Gregory* of *Cappadocia* intruded into his See) why it neither was, nor could be esteemed generall, or such as should binde the whole Church, by the decrees made by it, for said *Iulius*<sup>c</sup>, they did against the Canons of the Church, *ὅτι μὴ τὸν τὸν ἀποστόλον ἢ τὸν ἐκκλησίαν ἐν ἡμετέροις*, because they did not so much as call him to that Synod; whereas the Canons of the Church forbid that any decree (which should have power to binde the whole Church) should bee made without the sentence, judgement, and consent of the Bishop of *Rome*, (either attained, or at least sought for.) The Canon which *Iulius* mentioned, might well ordaine, and if there were no such Canon, yet even reason and equity doe teach, that such decrees as concerne the whole Church, and are to binde them all, ought to be made by the helpe, judgement, and advise of them all, according to the rule, *Quod à omnes tangit, ab omnibus approbari debet*. The wilfull omission of any one Bishop, much more of the Bishop of *Rome*, who then was the chiefe Patriarch in the world, declares the Councell not to be generall, seeing unto it there was onely a partiall, and not a generall summons or calling.

4. As this first condition is required to the generality, so are the other two for the lawfulnessse and order of Synods : For if the Apo-  
files

*b Extat tom. 1.  
Cont. pa. 420.*

*c Apud Sac. L. 2  
ca. 13. et Zoroem.  
lib. 3. ca. 9.*

*d Reg. Iur. 29.*

files rule, Let <sup>c</sup> all things be done decently, and in order, must bee kept in every private and particular Church, how much more in those venerable assemblies of Oecumenicall Councils, which are the Armies of God, & of the Angels of all the Churches of God, among whom doth, and ought to shine gravity, prudence, and all sacred, and fitting orders, no lesse than in the coelestiall Hierarchy, and in the very presence of the Majesty of God. If they bee gathered in Gods name, how can they be other than lawfull and orderly Assemblies, seeing God <sup>f</sup> is not the God of confusion <sup>e</sup>, or disorder, but of peace in all Churches. Now the lawfulnessse and order of Synods, consists partly in their orderly assembling, and partly in their orderly government and proceedings, when they are assembled; whensoever the Bishops of any generall Councell first assemble together by lawfull authority, and then are so governed by lawfull authority also; that orderly, lawfull, and due synodall proceedings be onely used therein, as well in the free and diligent discussion of the causes proposed, as in the free sentencing thereof, the same is truly and properly to bee called <sup>h</sup> *lawfull Synod*: But if either of these conditions be wanting, it becomes unlawfull and disorderly. If the Bishops assemble together, either not being called, or if called, yet not by such as have right and authority to call them; though this in a large acception may bee called a Synod, that is, an assembly of Bishops, yet because they doe unlawfully & disorderly assemble together, it is in propriety of speech to be termed a Cōventicle, a riotous, tumultuous, & seditious assembly; even such as that was of *Demetrius* <sup>i</sup>, & the other Ephesiāns, who, without calling and order, <sup>j</sup> rushed <sup>k</sup> & run headlong together to uphold the honour of their great *Diana*; which both the Spirit of God condemneth, as a confused <sup>l</sup> or disorderly assembly, and the more wise among them taxed, as a riotous and seditious <sup>m</sup> tumult. If being lawfully called, yet they either want a lawfull President to governe them; or having one, yet want freedome and liberty either in discussing or giving judgement in the cause; such a Synod, though in respect of their assembling it be lawfull, yet in respect of their proceedings and judgment, it is unlawfull, and disorderly, and therefore in propriety of speech to be termed a conspiracy, because those men conspire and band themselves, as did the Councell <sup>n</sup> of the Priests with *Pilate*, by unjust and unlawfull meanes to suppress the truth, and oppresse innocency.

5. But unto whō belongs that right to call general Councils, & whē they are called, to see orderly & synodal proceedings observed therein? To whom? to whom else but only to those who have Imperiall & Regal authority, whether they be one (as whē the Empire was united, & the whole Christiā world subject to his authority;) or moe, as it was when the Empire was devided, and ever since that great dissolution of it in the time <sup>o</sup> of *Charles* the great: To them, and them onely, this right to belong, I have in two other bookes, the one concerning the

C I Cor. 14. 40.

f I Cor. 14. 33.  
g d'ignitatem  
synodaliū  
indignitatis  
indignitatis

h Act. 19. 39.

i 1b. v. 24. et seq.  
k ibid. v. 29.  
l tumultuosa  
m tumultuosa  
n Periclitamur  
argui seditionis.  
v. 40.

n Mat. 26. 59.  
o ca. 27. 2.  
p Act. 4. 27.

o Circa an. 800.

calling, the other concerning the Presidencie in Councils, at large and clearly demonstrated; & I hold them to be so evident truths, both by the doctrine of Scripture, and by the constant judgement and practice of the Catholike Church, for more than eight hundred years after Christ, that if any would reade the Tomes of the Councils, hee had need put out both his eyes, if he will not see this.

p Rom. 13. 2, 3.

q 1/a. 49. 23.

r 1 Pet. 2. 2.

s Num. 27. 17.

t Psal. 78. 71, 72.

u Tam Hebraice

quam in 70. In-

terpret. et apud

Hier. legitur

[ad pascendum

Iacob populum

suum] et [pavit

eos] quod aliq

vertunt, ad re-

gendum.

v Non proprie

dicitur pascere

alium, qui cibum

quacunque rati-

one ministrat,

sed qui procurat

et providet alteri

cibum, quod est

certè Præpositi, et

gubernatoris, &

Alius Pastoralis

nomen est tantum

probere cibum,

sed etiam ducere,

et c. Bell. lib. 1.

de Pont. Rom.

ca. 19. § Primi.

et § Deinde.

x Jobn. 21. 15.

y 17.

y Cum ei (Petro)

dicitur, ad omnes

dicitur, Am. 15

me pascere oves

meas. Aug. lib. de

dogm. Christi. ca.

30.

z Ier. 23. 1, 2.

Exech. 34. per

totum, et Act. 20

28. et 1 Pet. 5. 2.

a 1 Pet. 2. 17.

b Ibid. v. 30.

c Rom. 13. 1.

d Ibid. v. 4.

e Chrys. in ca.

13. ad Rom.

6. To them, and them onely is the sword <sup>p</sup> given by God, that by it they might maintaine the faith, and use it to the praise of them that doe well, but take vengeance on them that doe evill: *They are the nursing & fathers of the Church*, unto whom the care is committed by God, that all his Children, to whom they, next unto God, are fathers, be fed with the sincere milke <sup>r</sup> of Gods word, all mixture and poison of heresie and impiety being taken away, and severed from it: They are like *Ioshua* <sup>s</sup> and *David*, appointed by God to be *pastours*, <sup>t</sup> even supreme Pastours of the Israel of God, not indeed to teach and give the food themselves, (which duty belongs to their inferiour servants) yet to performe those w<sup>ch</sup> are the principall & most <sup>u</sup> proper Pastoral acts & offices, *procurare ac providere alteri cibū, ducere, reducere, tueri, præesse, regere, castigare*, to provide that all the sheepe of Christ have wholesome and convenient food given unto them, to lead them, bring them backe, defend, governe, and chastise them when they will not obey their Pastoral call and command. None of all which Pastoral duties were it possible for Kings to performe, if for publike tranquillity and institution of Gods people they might not by their authority assemble a generall Councell of Bishops, and being assembled, if they might not defend and uphold all just and equall, but castigate and keepe away all violent, fraudulent, and unjust proceedings in such Councils.

7. I purposely said *supreme Pastours*; for none is ignorant, that *Peter* <sup>x</sup> and all the Apostles equally with him, as also all <sup>y</sup> who either in their Presbyteriall or Episcopall authority succeed unto them (for in their *Apostolicall* none of them had or have any successour) that all these are Pastours <sup>z</sup> also of Gods flock, but they are all subordinate to the Imperiall Pastours of the people of God, the sheep-hooke is subject to the Scepter, the Crozier to the Imperiall Crowne. Concerning Kings Saint *Peter* gives a generall precept, *Feare God* <sup>a</sup>; and honour the King; which honour he expressly calleth subjection <sup>b</sup> and obedience in the same Chapter; first wee owe obedience to God, and next God, unto Kings and Emperours. Concerning all others excepting Kings, and such as have Kingly authority, Saint *Paul* gives a like generall precept, *Let every soule be subject to the higher powers*, even to those, who by Gods warrant, and as his Vicegerents, doe beare <sup>c</sup> the sword: to them every soule ought to be subject; who can except thee from this generality? This is commanded, saith *Chrysostome* <sup>d</sup>, *Not onely to secular men, but to all, to Monkes, to Priests and Bishops*, the Apostle teacheth them, *ex debito obedire, even in duty to obey Kings and Princes*, <sup>e</sup>



*sive Apostolus sis, sive Propheta, sive Euangelista, sive quisquis tandem fueris;* not the Prophets, not the Apostles, not the Euangelists, not any soule is exempt from this subjection: and if not *Peter* himselfe, then certainly not his Vicar, as the Pope <sup>f</sup> calls himselfe: And this very subjection of the Pope, and all Bishops to the Emperours, to omit *Silvester, Iulius, Leo, and Gregorie*, Pope *Agatho* in most submissive manner acknowledgeth almost seven hundred & years after Christ, <sup>h</sup> *Omnes nos praesules, vestri imperij famuli;* All we Bishops are the servants of your imperiall highnesse, saith *Agatho*, and a Synod of 125 Westerne Bishops with him; to which purpose hee calls *Italy* his servile <sup>i</sup> Province; and *Rome* his servile City; adding, that he did this at the Emperours sacred command, *pro obedientia satisfactione, pro obedientia quam debimus,* for that obedience which hee did owe to the Emperour; nay, yet in more lowly manner, he saith not, that hee, but, *studiosa obedientia nostri famulatus implevit;* the willing obedience of his owne servitude to the Emperour, did performe this. Nor was this the profession onely of *Agatho*; and the Westerne Bishops, but the whole sixth Councell approved the same, *Petrus* <sup>k</sup> per *Agathonem* loquebatur, Saint Peter spake by the mouth of *Agatho*. Now because they all acknowledge the Pope to be the first and chiefe Bishop in the Church, (for they all in that Councell approve <sup>l</sup> the Councils of *Chalcedon*, and first *Constantinopolitane*, in both <sup>m</sup> w<sup>ch</sup> that is decreed) seeing by the confession of *Agatho*, by them approved, the Pope is a servant, and oweth subjection and obedience to the Emperour; much more are all other Bishops in the whole world, servants, and subjects to the Imperial command, and that by the consenting judgment of the whole catholike Church, represented in that sixth generall Councell.

8. The same Sovereignty, and supreme Pastorall authority of Kings, is after this againe testified in that which they call the eighth generall Councell, more than <sup>n</sup> eight hundred and sixty yeares after CHRIST. *Basilius* the Emperour said before the Councell, in his letters <sup>o</sup> unto them, *The government of the Ecclesiasticall ship is by the Divine Providence committed unto us: in that ship doth saile all who are members of the Church, Bishops or Laicks, and the government of the whole ship is given to the Emperour; Hee, like the Pilot, rules and directs all. Raderus* the Iesuite, and *Binius* following him, in stead of *nobis* have put *vobis* in the latine text; as if *Basilius* had said, that the government of the Church belonged to Bishops; not to Emperours: It is a Iesuiticall and fraudulent trick, for which no colour of excuse can bee made: The Greeke set on the very opposite Page <sup>p</sup>, is *nobis*; *nobis*: in the *Surian* Colle<sup>q</sup>io<sup>n</sup> of those Acts, it was rightly read *nobis*; their owne Cardinall *Cusanus* <sup>r</sup> out of the ancient Acts of that Synod, cites it, *commisisset nobis*: the very sense inforceth it to be *nobis*, for the Emperour addeth, *Therefore doe wee with all sollicitude exhort and warne you, that you come to the holy Oecumenicall Synod*: which had beene a most foolish collection, had he not said *nobis*, but *vobis*, for then not

<sup>f</sup> Quem Primum dioces Synodus dixit, praeter Apolloniam primi Vicarium. Nich. 1. Epist. 8. <sup>g</sup> Quem: g Conc. 6. habitum an. 680 Bar. et Bin. <sup>h</sup> Conc. 6. Act. 4. pa. 22. in Epist. Agathonis et Rom. Synodi. <sup>i</sup> Epist. Agath. Act. 4. pa. 12. b.

<sup>k</sup> Sermo a clamo. matotius Conc. generalis 6. Act. 18. pa. 89. b. <sup>l</sup> Desinit Concil. 6. Act. 17. pa. 80. a. <sup>m</sup> Conc. 2. Can. 9 et Conc. Chal. Act. 16. post Can. 27.

<sup>n</sup> Conc. illud 8. habit. an. 863. Bar. et Bin. <sup>o</sup> Conc. 8. Act. 1. pa. 880. b.

<sup>p</sup> Apud Rad. pa. 224. <sup>q</sup> Exstat apud Bin. 10. 3. Can. pa. 858. <sup>r</sup> Cusan. lib. 3. de Concor. Casbi ca. 19.

1 Conc. 3. Añ. 1.  
pa. 386. b.

1 Bell. lib. 1. de  
Pontif. Rom. ca.  
15. §. At nobis.

to him, but to them should have belonged the care to call the Bishops to the Synod; yet against all these evidences of truth *Raderus* and *Binnus* falsifie the text, corrupt the words, and pervert the sense, by turning *nobis* into *vobis*, that so they might deprive the Emperour of that supreme authority which *Basilium* there professed to belong unto himselfe, and the Legates of the Patriarchs, in the name of the whole Synod approved the Emperours saying<sup>f</sup>, *Recte Imperatores nostri monere, the Emperours have said well*. To goe no further in this matter, that which was cited out of the Scripture concerning *Ioshua* and *David*, doth clear this point; for seeing all who sit in Imperiall thrones, are like *Ioshua* and *David*, to feed the Israel of God; and the Israel of God contains the whole flocke and all the sheepe of Christ, *ex hac ipsa voce Pasce, difficile non est demonstrare summam potestatem ei attribui*; It is easie even by this very word Feed, to demonstrate, that supreme power doth belong to Kings, seeing unto them it is said, Feed my sheepe, feed my people: Wherefore seeing Kings are commanded by God to rule by their Pastorall authoritie all others, and all others are commanded to obey, and bee subject unto them and their Imperiall commands, as unto their supreme Pastour here upon earth; it hence unavoydably followeth, that Bishops neither without that Imperiall command, may in a riotous manner assemble in generall Councils, nor being commanded by them, may deny to assemble, nor being assembled may refuse to bee ordered and governed by their Imperiall Presidency.

u 1 Chr. 34. 29.

30.

x 2 Chron. 15.

9. 10.

y 2 Chron. 5. 2.

z 1 Chron. 13. 5.

⊕ cap. 15. 4.

a 1 Chron. 23. 2.

b 2 Chron. 29. 4.

c Ibid. v. 11.

d Ibid. v. 15.

e Iosh. 24. 2.

9. After these precepts of GOD, looke to the practice of the Church, and you shall see that lawfull Synods or Assemblies about Ecclesiasticall affaires, have beene gathered by no other than Imperiall authority, as well in the old as new Testament. In the time of *Iosia* when the Temple was purged from those manifold Idolatries, wherewith it was polluted, who assembled Israel? the Priests? no, but the King<sup>a</sup> sent and gathered all the Elders of Iuda, and went into the house of the LORD with the Priests and Levites: The like had *Asa* done in the oath of Association, He<sup>x</sup> gathered all Iuda: *Salomon* in the Dedication of the Temple, He<sup>y</sup> assembled the Elders and the heads of the Tribes; *David* in bringing the Arke, and in ordering the offices of the Temple, *David*<sup>z</sup> gathered all Israel together; Hee<sup>a</sup> gathered together then all the Princes, with the Priests and Levites: *Hezechia* in cleansing the house of the Lord, He<sup>b</sup> gathered the Priests and Levites, called<sup>c</sup> them his sonnes; and they were gathered together, *juxta*<sup>d</sup> *mandatum Regis*, according to the commandment of the King. *Ioshua* at the renewing of the Covenant, He<sup>e</sup> assembled all the Tribes of Israel. And to mention no more, (for what King is there, or Iudge, or Captaine, who had all kingly authoritie, though somewhat qualified and tempered in them more than in Kings) who is not an example hereof? Consider but *Moses*, who was the first that had soveraignty in their common-wealth; how often and still with a warrant from God did he assemble the people upon urgēt occasions? Ar

At the first making of the covenant with God, Moses called <sup>f</sup> the Elders; at the publishing of the law, Moses brought <sup>g</sup> the people out of their tents unto God: after the bringing of the two Tables from God, Moses assembled <sup>h</sup> all the congregation of Israel: at the anointing and investing of Aaron, Moses <sup>i</sup> assembled all the congregation: at the repeating of the Covenant, he <sup>k</sup> commanded all the Elders of the Tribes of Israel to come unto him. Yea at the very first time, when God appointed him to be a Captaine and Ruler over his people, even then God gave unto him that authority (which afterwards he renewed in the tenth <sup>l</sup> of Numbers) to congregate and assemble the people of God; Goe, saith God <sup>m</sup>, and gather the Elders of Israel together: thereby teaching the power of assembling Gods people to be inseparably annexed unto Imperiall, regall, and soveraigne authority; that none hath the one who hath not the other by the very warrant of God committed unto him, to the end the assemblies of Gods people might not be tumultuous and seditious, as was that of Demetrius, and of Corah <sup>n</sup>, Dathan, and Abiram, which the Lord severely revenged, but lawfull and orderly, as God is the author not of confusion, but of order in all Churches, and in all ages of the Church.

10. Come we to the times of the Gospell. The power and rightfull authority to call Synods was ever in the Emperours and Kings, even in those three hundred years while the Church was in most grievous persecutiop under Heathen Emperours: The right and power was in the Heathen as well as in Christian Emperours; in Tiberius as well as Theodosius; in Dioclesian, as well as in Constantine Or Justinian. But that power which they rightly had, they did not use aright: not to call Synods to maintaine the faith; but to abolish Synods, Bishops, Christians, and utterly extirpate the Christian faith. Now because Christ had layd an absolute necessity <sup>o</sup> upon the Apostles, and their successors, to feed, to teach, and maintaine the doctrine of faith; and seeing they could not doe this with the allowance, or so much as connivence of the Emperours, who in duty should have protected them in so doing, yea have caused them so to doe; this very necessity enforced them, and was a lawfull warrant unto them, both to feed the flocke, preach the Gospell, and to hold Synods in the best and most convenient manner that they then could, not onely without, but against the will and command of the Emperors, that higher command of Christ over-ruling theirs. Whereby are warranted as lawfull, to say nothing of that Acts 15. those Synods at Antioch against Paulus Samosatenus at Rome, against the Novatians in Africke, many in the time of Cyprian, and divers the like. For even the law of God, to yeeld unto necessity, the example of David <sup>p</sup>, the doctrine of our Saviour, doth demonstrate; besides those many Maximes, which are all grounded on this truth, as, that necessity <sup>q</sup> hath no law, nor is subject to any law, but is a law of it selfe: that many things are lawfull in case of necessity, which otherwise are unlawfull: that of Leo, Inculpabile iudicium, quod necessitas intulit; that is blamelesse which necessity doth warrant: and many the like, which Pope John <sup>r</sup> alledgeth. This, and nothing else, doth declare those Synods to have beene lawfull, though assem-

f Exod. 19.7.

g Exod. 19.17.

h Exod. 35.1.

i Levit. 8.3.4.

k Deut. 5.1. &amp;

ca. 31.28.

l Num. 10.2.

m Make thee two Trumpets, that thou maist use them for the assembling of the congregation.

n Exod. 9.16.

o Num. 16.2.

p &amp;c.

q 1 Cor. 9.16.

r Marth. 23.19.

p Marth. 11.2.

q &amp;c.

r Dioclesianum

habet legem, sed

ipsa sibi facit legem. Conf. 1. q. 2.

ca. 39. Ramifflo

nem.

r Gloss. in cap.

Disciplin. de

consec. dist. 8.

5. in marg.

f. C. 1. 10. 2.

h. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.

1. 1. 1. 1. 1.

1. 1. 1. 1. 1.



assembled without Imperiall authority: as the times were extraordinary, so their extraordinary assembling was by those times of necessity made lawfull. But as soone as Emperours began to professe the faith, and to use their owne, and Imperiall authority, in assembling Bishops for consulting about causes of faith; the Catholike Bishops knowing that from thence that law of Necessity was now expired and out of date, attempted not then to come to Synods uncalled, nor refused to come when they were called; though sometimes they came with an assured expectation of the crowne of Martyrdome before they departed; as in the Councils of *Millane*, *Arimine*, and *Syrmiun*, called by the Arrian Emperour *Constantius*, is most cleare.

II. Hence it is that all the ancient generall Councils, yea all that were held for the space of a thousand yeares after Christ, were all assembled by no other than this Imperiall authority: Take a short view offome, and of the chiefe of them. Of the first *Nicen*, *Eusebius* saith, *Constantine* assembled this Oecumenicall Councell, hee called the Bishops by his letters, and his call was mandatory, for *Mandatum erat, imperatori ad hanc rem*; *Constantine* commanded that they should come. The very Synod it selfe writeth thus in their Synodall letters, *We are assembled by the grace of God, & mandato Imperatoris*, and by the mandate of *Constantine the Emperour*: so *Christopher* son translates *αυτοκρατορική* *ἐπιστολή*, both in *Socrates* and *Theodoret*. Of the second, their owne Synodall Epistle to *Theodosius* witnesseth; *We came hither, ex mandato pietatis, by the command of your Imperiall highnesse*. Of the third Councell, the Synodall acts and Epistles are cleare witnesses: *Your Highnes hath commanded by your holy Edict, the Bishops out of the whole world to come to Ephesus*. Again, the synod being assembled in *Samis*, by the Edict, decree, authority and appointment of the Emperour: and the like is repeated I think not so little as threescore times in those Acts. And as they came at the Emperours command, so would they not depart without his leave and licence. *We beseech your piety that you will at length free us from this exile*: and the Emperour granted their request; for, *injungit eis, he commanded & enjoyned them to returne to their owne Cities*: and againe, *Regio. mandato imperatorum est singulis Episcopis*, there was a mandate to all the Bishops by the Emperour to returne to their owne Provinces. Of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, the whole Synod saith in their Epistle to Pope *Leo*, *This holy and generall Synod was assembled by the grace of God, & sanctione Imperatorum, and by the sanction or decree of our most holy Emperours*. Again, this synod was gathered, *ex decreto Imperatorum, by the decree of the Emperours: secundum iussione, according to his command*. And the like is repeated almost in every action. Of the fift we shewed before that it was called *Iussione piissimi Imperatoris, by the command of the most holy Emperour Iustinian*. Of the sixt it is usually said, it was assembled, *secundum Imperialis sanctionem aut decretum*, and the like, by the Imperiall sanction or decree. And the whole Councell in their prospheticall oration to the Emperour, saith unto him; *your majestie hath congregated this holy and great assembly*. Of their second *Nicene* it is said, that it was assembled, *per piimum Decretum, Sanctionem, Mandatum*,

1 Euseb. lib. 3. de  
vit. Constant. c. 6

in Citantur ver-  
ba, cum a Sacr.  
lib. 2. ca. 6. tum  
a Theodor. lib. 1.  
ca. 11.  
n Epist. Synod.  
Conc. Const. 1.  
apud Bin. to. 1.  
Conc. pa. 518.  
o ἡμεῖς δὲ διὰ το-  
ῦτο καὶ παρὰ τὴν  
ἐξουσίαν τοῦ ἡμῶν  
ἱεροῦ καὶ ἐκείνου  
ἐπιστολῆς ἐκείνου  
ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν  
ἐλθόντες ἐπὶ τῇ  
ἐκείνου ἐπιστολῇ  
το. 4. ca. 11.  
p Act. Conc. E-  
phes. to. 2. ca. 1.  
q Epist. Synodi  
ad Imper. to. 2.  
Act. Conc. Eph.  
ca. 17.  
r ἐκ τῆς αὐτοῦ το. 5.  
Act. Conc. Eph.  
ca. 11.  
s ἐκ τῆς αὐτοῦ libid.  
t Epist. Syn.  
Chalc. post Act.  
16.  
u Conc. Chalc.  
Act. 1. pa. 1.  
x Conc. y. Coll. 8.  
pa. 584. a.  
y Conc. 6. Act.  
1. 2. 3. & reli-  
quis.  
z Conc. 6. Act.  
18. pa. 39. a.  
a Conc. Nicene.  
Act. 1. pa. 297. a  
& Act. 2. pa. 308  
b. c. m. 5. pa.  
338. b.

datum, by the holy Decree, Sanction, and Mandate of the Emperors: of that which they call the eighth, the synodall definition expresseth, *Quod à<sup>b</sup> Basilio Imperatore coactum*, that it was assembled by Basilius the Emperour; and the whole Synod cryed out, We all thinke so; we all subscribe to these things. And Pope Stephen in his letters to Basilius, speaking of this Synod, saith<sup>c</sup>, Did not the Romane See send Legates to the Councell, *in his divitipatens ov, te imperante*, Raderus and Binius translate it, but it is rather to be read, *ad imperium*, and *summam iussionem tuam*, the Pope sent Legates, not when Basilius was Emperour, (which was no great honour or token of duty to be done:) but at the most high command of Basilius; which testified his subjection and duty to the Emperour, whom the Pope in that same Epistle acknowledgeth to be the highest<sup>d</sup> person who here upon earth sustaines the person of Christ: and in the sixt Action of the same<sup>e</sup> Councell, it is said, *Imperator hanc Synodum coegit*, the Emperour assembled this Synod.

12. Thus all those Councells which are usually reckoned for generall and approved, for the space of a thousand yeares, were all called by Imperiall iussion and command; the religious Emperours exercising that right in commanding all Bishops, even the Popes to such Councells; all the Bishops, even the Popes, by their willing obedience acknowledging that authority and power to be in the Emperours, and therefore they gladly obeyed those imperiall iussions and commands. And as they were all assembled by Imperiall calling, so were they all governed by Imperiall presidency. That Constantine was President in the Nicene, Pope Stephen in the Epistle lately cited expressly witnesseth: *Doe you not remember*, saith he<sup>f</sup>, *what Pope Silvester said in the Nicene Synod, presidente ibi S. Constantino*, Saint Constantine being President therein. His owne Acts in the Councell, of moderating<sup>g</sup>, and representing the jarres of the Bishops, of burning<sup>h</sup> their bookes of accusations and quarrels, of drawing them to unity, that with one consent they should define the causes proposed, doe manifest the same: for all these are acts of the Imperiall presidency. That Theodosius was President in the second, may appeare, not onely for that he was present<sup>i</sup> therein, and present no doubt as Constantine had beene before, as a moderator of their actions; but that small remainder of the Acts of that Councell import also the same: for he directed, and that by his *Mandatum*<sup>k</sup>, what the Bishops should doe: and when they out of their partiall affections would have preferred each his owne friend to the See of Constantinople, the Emperour perceiving that, corrected their partiall judgement, *Iussit<sup>l</sup> inscribere charta*, hee commanded them to write a bill of such men as they thought fit for the place; himselfe nominated Nestarius; and though many of the Bishops at first contradicted that choice, yet he drew them all to his sentence, and so the whole Synod consented upon the ordination of Nestarius.

13. For the holy Ephesine Synod, all the Acts are full of this Imperiall Presidency. The Emperours sent Candidianus<sup>m</sup> to keepe away tumults, and disorderly<sup>n</sup> persons from the Councell: to see that no<sup>o</sup> dissension and private quarrels might hinder their grave consultations, the free and exact discussion of the causes proposed, and to provide that every one might free-

b Conc. 8. Act. 10. pa. 897. a.

c Epist. Stephan. post Conc. 8. pa. 900.

d Quamvis superiorem Christi in terris personam formamq. gerit. Steph. Ep. eadem. p. 899. b. e Conc. 8. act. 6. pa. 886. a.

f Steph. Papa in Epist. ad Basil. Imper. post 8. Conc. g Euseb. lib. 3. de vit. Const. ca. 13. h Russ lib. 1. c. 2. i Ipsi, presente Theodosio. Epist. Iustin. post Conc. 5. pa. 605. a. k Insuperq. mandaret Imperator, ut diligens inquisito fieret. Sozom. lib. 7. c. 6. l Sozom. lib. 7. ca. 7. m Tom. 1. act. Conc. Ephes. ca. 32. n Non licet illis qui necessarij non sunt, dogmatum examen aliquo tumultu impedire. ibid. o Vt diligenter prospiciat ne quae gravior dissensio synodi consultationem obstruat. ibid.

free.

*p* *Ut omnibus & singulis recte perceptis, singuli quod visum fuerit, in medio proppnati, vel ab aliis proposita, si opus id fuerit, refutare. ibid.*  
*q* *Sacr. Imper. ad Synodum, 10. 3. act. Conc. Eph. ca. 17.*  
*s* *Primo omnis Actorum monumentis reverentiam pietatis vestra literas quasi Facem quamdam premisiimus. Ep. synod. ad Imp. 10. 3. act. Conc. Eph. ca. 22.*  
*f* *Etiam atque etiam rogamus vestram Majestatem ut sanct. synod. studium erga Deum agnoscat, ut Candidianum & quinque praeterea & sacra synodo Episcopos ad se accersat, qui omnia & singula quae Episcopis gesta sunt pietati vestrae ordinis & coram exponant. Epist. synod. ad Imp. 10. 4. act. Conc. Eph. ca. 10. & idem ca. 11.*  
*s* *Annuit tandem illorum votis Imperator. Brev. in arg. cap. 19. 20. 4. act. Conc. Ephes.*  
*v* *Vestra pietas nostra supplicatione inflexa mandavit, ut S. Synodus quos voluerit amad et qui universarum rerum statum coram exponant. Relat. synod. ad Imper. 10. 4. act. Conc. Ephes. ca. 22.*  
*N* *ostre preces sunt ut iudicium a tua pietate accipiamus. Iohan. & convent. cum expetit. ad Imper. Append. ad 10. 2. Act. Conc. Ephes. ca. 2. pa. 787. b.*  
*x* *Decretum regium, 10. 5. act. Conc. Ephes. ca. 11.*  
*y* *Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 19. 5. Quartam. 2. Act. 1. Conc. Chal. pa. 4. b.*  
*Aut ille egrediatur, aut nos eximur.*  
*a* *Si iudicium obtines personam, non ut accusator debes prosequi. ibid. pa. 5. b.*  
*b* *Act. 4. Conc. Chal. pa. 89. b.*

freely & with leifure propose what was needfull, and have scope to refuse all doubts proposed by others. The Emperours when they heard of the dissentions and disorders among the Bishops, writ unto them to take a better and more peaceable and orderly examination of the cause, saying *q*, *Majestas nostra ea qua acta sunt pro raris & legitimis habere non potest*; our Majesty cannot hold or esteeme those acts done so disorderly, for firme and synodall; nay we decree that all things which hitherto have beene done, *pro irritis, & nullis habenda esse*, shall be accounted of no force, but utterly void and frustrate: than which no greater tokens of Imperiall Presidency can be devised. The whole and holy Synod willingly submitted themselves to this presidency. In their proceedings the Emperours letters were their direction, and as themselves professe, the very Torch to guide all their actions. In the manifold injuries and contumelies which they endured at the hands of *Iohn*, with his Conventicle, they fled to the Emperour, beseeching him to be Iudge of their equall proceedings, and take an exact view and examination of their doings; which upon their request the Emperour did, and called five Bishops of either part to *Constantinople* to declare the whole cause unto him; after which being performed, he gave judgement for the holy Councell, and adnulled all the acts of the Conventicle, as the holy Synod had earnestly and humbly entreated him. So fully and cleerly doth that sacred and Oecumenicall Councell, wherein was the judgement and consent of the whole Catholike Church, both acknowledge this Imperiall right of Presidency in the Emperours, and submit themselves unto it.

14. For the Councell of Chalcedon, the matter is so evident, that *Bellarmino*, though struggling against the truth, could not deny it. There were present, saith he, in this Councell secular Iudges, deputed by the Emperour, who were not Iudges of controversies of faith, (to give a decisive suffrage therein, for that belongs to no secular man whatsoever) *sed tantum an omnia fierent legitime, sine vi & fraude & tumultibus*, but they were Iudges onely of Synodall order, whether all things were done lawfully, without force, fraud and tumult. And in this doth the very Imperiall Presidency consist. And truly how religiously and worthily those glorious Iudges performed that honourable office in the synod, all the actions thereof doe make manifest: for scarce any matter was done in the synod, but the same was ordered, moderated, and guided by their prudence and authority. The Popes Legats very insolently took upon them at the beginning, willing that *Dioscorus* might bee put out of the synod, and sayd *z*, *Either let Dioscorus goe out, or we will depart*. The Iudges gravely reprov'd this stomacke in the Legates, telling them, *If you will be Iudges, you must not prosecute as accusers*: nor did they suffer *Dioscorus* to goe away, but commanded him, as was fit, to sit in the place of the *Rei*. The cause of *Iuvenalis* and *Thalassius* was proposed to the synod; It could not be examined by them, till they had leave from the Emperour; We, said the Iudges, have acquainted the



Emperour therewith, and we expect his Mandate herein: and after they had received the Emperours minde, they then told the synod, *Imperator sententia vestra permittit de invenale deliberare*, the Emperour hath upon your intreaty permitted you to discusse and judge the cause of *Invenalis*, *Thalassius*, and the rest. In the cause<sup>d</sup> of the ten Egyptian Bish. the Synod had almost pronounced a temerarious sentence against them, as hereticall, when indeed they were orthodoxall; the Bishops cryed out, *Isti heretici sunt*, these ten are heretikes. The glorious Iudges knowing which was manifest, that they forbore to subscribe, by reason of a custome which they had, that they might doe nothing without their Patriarke, who was not then chosen; and not as thinking heretically in the faith, moderated the Synod in that matter, saying, *Rationabile nobis & clemens videtur*, it seemes to us to be reason, and an act of clemencie, not to have condemned them, but staid till their Patriarch bee chosen: the whole Synod consented to this grave sentence of the Iudges, & made a Canon<sup>f</sup> for that purpose. In making the very definition of faith, there grew a great dissention in the Synod; some<sup>g</sup> would have it one, some another way set downe; in so much that the Popes Legates were ready to make a schisme, and depart<sup>h</sup> from the Councell, and hold another Councell by themselves. The glorious Iudges proposed a most equall and fitting meanes to have the matter peaceably debated, and the whole Synod brought to unity: But when out-cryes<sup>i</sup> and tumult prevailed above reason, the Iudges complained of those discords to the Emperour, and, *Imperator<sup>k</sup> praecepit*, the Emperour commanded them to follow the direction of the Iudges, which they did, and so with one accord consented on the Definition of faith. The Emperour at the earnest entreaty of *Basianus*, commanded<sup>l</sup> the Synod to examine the whole cause betwixt him and *Stephanus*, to which of them in right the See of *Ephesus* belonged; The Synod would have given sentence for *Basianus*, *Iustitia<sup>m</sup> Basianum vocat*, Equity and right doth call for *Basianus* to bee the Bishop of that place; The glorious Iudges weighing the cause more circumspectly, thought that neither of them both could in right be Bishop: The whole Synod being directed by them, altered their opinion, and said<sup>n</sup>, This is a just sentence, this is the very judgment of God: When there was a difference in the Synod, about the dignity of *Constantinople*, the greater part<sup>o</sup> holding one way, and the Popes Legates the contrary<sup>p</sup>, the glorious Iudges judicially<sup>q</sup> sentenced, which was to stand for the Iudgement of the Synod; and the whole Councell in their synodall letter consented<sup>r</sup> therunto. So many, so manifest evidences there are of the Imperiall Prefidency in that holy Councell, not any of all those Catholikes once repining at, or contradicting the same.

15. For the first, that it was ordered by the Imperiall authoritie, may appeare, in that both the Emperor was sometimes by 'himselfe', sometimes by his glorious<sup>s</sup> Iudges, present in the Synod, and specially in that hee tooke order, that liberty<sup>t</sup> and synodall freedome should be observed therein; yea, as the whole Synod testifieth, hee did<sup>u</sup> *omnia*, all things which preserve the peace of the Church, and unity in the Catholike faith: The sixth Councell is abundant with proofes of

clbid.  
d Añ. 4. Conc.  
chal. pa. 90. Om-  
nes clamaverunt,  
Isti heretici sunt  
c Añ. caem 3.  
pa. 90 b.  
f Can. 30. Añ. 15  
g Non recte ha-  
bet definitio,  
c. Añ. 5. cōc.  
chal. pa. 93. b.  
h Iubeat nobis  
rescriptum dari  
ut revertamur  
et ibi Synodus  
celebretur. lbid.  
i Suggestum  
Imperatori cla-  
mores isti, &c.  
Añ. eadem. 5.  
pa. 94. a.  
k lbid.  
l Festinet vestra  
reverentia cau-  
sam discutere,  
&c. Litere Im-  
per. Añ. 11. cōc.  
chal. pa. 118. b.  
m Añ. eadem  
pa. 118. b.  
n lbid.  
o Hac omnes di-  
simul. Añ. 16.  
pa. 137. a.  
p Contradictio  
nostra hinc gestis  
inherent. lbid.  
q Quod interlo-  
quuti sumus in  
ta Synodus ap-  
probavit, & re-  
vult Indices. Jbi  
r confirmavi-  
mus regulam  
t 30. patrum,  
&c. Relatio Sy-  
nodi ad Leonem  
post Conc. chal.  
pa. 140. a.  
s cñ Iustinianus  
Synodo interef-  
set. Zonar. Ann.  
to. 3. in Iustin.  
e Coll. 1. Conc. 3.  
et Coll. 7.  
u M. ximē, cum  
pissimus impe-  
rator et nos ipsi  
licentiam dedi-  
mus unicuique su-  
am voluntatem  
facere manife-  
stā, sic dixit Sy-  
nodus. Coll. 2. pa.  
524. b. 1.  
x Coll. 7. p. 381.

y Conc. 6. Añ. 1  
 pa. 8. b. this presidency : *Macarius* said, O our most holy Lord, *iubeto* <sup>1</sup> *libros*  
*proferri*, command that the bookes bee produced; and the Emperour an-  
 swered, *Iubemus*, we command them to be brought; wee command them  
 to be read; and it was done. The Popes Legates say, *Petimus* <sup>2</sup> *ser-*  
*nitatem vestram*, we entreate your highnesse that this booke may be ex-  
 amined; the Emperour answered, *Quod postulat est proveniat*, let the  
 be done which you request : Againe, O most holy Lord, we intreat <sup>3</sup> *the*  
 the letters of Pope *Agatho* may be read; the Emperours answer was, what  
 you have desired, let it be done; and they were read: *Macarius* having  
 collected certaine testimonies out of the Fathers, for his opinon, in-  
 treated the Emperour, *Iubeto* <sup>b</sup> *relegi*, that he would command them to be  
 read; his answer was, let them bee read in order, and so they were:  
 The Popes Legates said, *petimus*, wee intreate <sup>c</sup> your highnesse, that  
 the authentike Copies may bee produced out of the Registrie; his an-  
 swer was, *fiat*, let it be done : The whole Synod intreated, If it <sup>d</sup> please  
 your piety, let *Theodorus* and the rest, stand in the midst, and there  
 make answer for themselves; his answer was, What the Synod hath  
 moved, *fiat*, let it be done: *George* Bish. of *Constantinople* said, O our Lord,  
 crowned by God, command <sup>e</sup> that the name of Pope *Vitalianus* may  
 bee set in the Dipticks; his answer was, *quod postulat est, fiat*, let the  
 be done which he hath requested. The Emperour commanded <sup>e</sup> the books  
 of *Macarius* to be read; the whole Synod answered, *Quod iustum est,*  
*what your highnesse hath commanded shall be performed.* After the authen-  
 ticall letters of *Sergius*, & Pope *Honorius* had been read in the Synod,  
 the glorious Iudges called <sup>f</sup> for the like authentick writings of *Pir-*  
*rhus*, *Paulus*, *Peter*, and *Cyrus*, to bee produced and read: the whole  
 Councell answered <sup>g</sup>, that it was superfluous, seeing their heresie was  
 manifest to all: the Iudges replied, *omnino* <sup>h</sup> *necessarium existit*, this is  
 necessary; that they be convicted out of their owne writings; and then  
 their writings were produced. I omit the rest, whereof every Añ.  
 on of that Synod is full; and by those Acts the Presidency in Councils  
 doth so clearly belöge to Emperors, and that also by the acknowledg-  
 ment <sup>i</sup> of that whole generall Councell, that *Albertus Pighius* being  
 unwilling to yeeld to this truth, hath purposedly writ <sup>k</sup> a most railing  
 and reviling Treatise against this holy generall Synod, condemning  
 both this Councell, and these Acts, as unlawfull, for this among other  
 reasons, because the Emperour with his Iudges, *plena* <sup>l</sup> *authoritate*  
*Præsides*, is President with full authority in the same; hee doth all, he pro-  
 poseth, hee questioneth, he commandeth, hee examineth, he judgeth,  
 he decreeth: And yet in all these hee doth nothing but what belongs  
 essentially to his Imperiall authority; nothing but what *Constantine*,  
*Theodosius*, *Martian*, and *Iustinian* had done before him, and done it  
 with the approbation and applause of the whole Church, and of all  
 the Catholike Bishops in those holy generall Councils; and hee per-  
 formed this with such uprightnesse and equality, that hee professed,  
*necessitatem* <sup>m</sup> *nullatenus inferre volumus*, wee will inforce no man, but  
 leave him at his owne freedome in sentencing the causes proposed,  
 and, *equalitatem* <sup>n</sup> *utriusque partis conservabimus*; we will bee equall and in-  
 different Iudges betwixt both parties.

in Sacra Imp.  
 Constantini Po-  
 gon. ante 6.  
 Conc. pa. 6. b.  
 n Ibid.

16. In the second Nicene, though by the fraud of *Anastasius* there be not many, yet are there some prints remaining of this Imperiall Presidencie; *We have received*, say the Emperours, *letters from Hadrian Bish. of Rome, sent by his Legates, qui et nobiscum in Concilio sedens, who also sit with us in the Synod*: Those letters, *jubemus publicè legi, we command to be publikely read according to the use in Councels*, and we command all you to marke them with decent silence: After that, you shall reade two quaternions also sent from the Bishops in the East; and the whole Synod obeyed the Imperiall commands. Pope *Hadrian* himselfe was not ignorant of this right in the Emperours, when sending his Pontificall and Cathedrall judgement concerning the cause of Images, hee said thus unto them, *We offer these things to your highnesse with all humility, that they may bee diligently examined, for we have but perfunctorie, that is, for fashion, and not exactly gathered these testimonies, and we have delivered them to your Imperiall Highnesse to be read, intreating and beseeching your mansuetude; yea, and as if I were lying at your feete, I pray and adjure you that you will command holy Images to bee restored*. Thus hee. When the Pope calls the Emperours his Lords, and submits both his owne person to their feet, and his judicall sentence to such tryall, as they shall thinke fit, doth not this import an higher Presidencie in the Emperour, than either himselfe or his Legates had in the Synod? Nay, it is further to be remembred, which will remaine as an eternal blot of that Synod, that *Irene* the Empresse, not contenting her selfe with the Imperiall, which was her owne rightfull authority, intruded her selfe into the Episcopall also; she forsooth would be a Doctor in the Councell; she present among the Bishops to teach the whole Councell what they should define in causes of faith: *Perversas Constitutiones tradere*, shee tooke upon her to give Constitutions, and those impious also, unto them: Those Constitutions backed with her sword and authority, the Bishops of the Councell had not the hearts and courage to withstand: All which is testified in the *Libri Carolini*, which in part were written, and wholly set forth by *Charles* the great, being for the most part composed by the Councell at *Frankford*, and approved by them all in that great synod. A truth so cleare, that Pope *Adrian* in his reply to those Caroline bookes, denyeth not *Irene* to have done this, (which had easily and evidently refuted that objection, and discredited those Caroline Bookes for ever) but hee defends her fact by the examples of *Helena* and *Pulcheria*, to which this of *Irene* is so unlike, that for this very cause she is by the whole Councell of *Frankford*, consisting of three hundred Bishops, or thereabouts, resembled to the tyrannizing and usurping *Athalia*. Lastly, when that whole Synod came to the Kingly City for the Imperiall confirmation of their Acts, seeing it is expressly testified by *Zonaras*, and *Paulus Diaconus*, that the Emperour was President in that assembly of the Bishops, why should it not by like reason be thought, that both himselfe when hee was present, and in his absence the secular Judges, his Deputies, held the same Imperial Presidencie in the Nicene Synod?

*y Lib. Carol. lib. 3. ca. 13. 2 Commentaria in regia Presidentibus Imperatoribus recitarent, quæ statim obpugnata sunt. Zonar. to 3. in vita Iren et Const. 2 Ingressus sunt omnes Episcopi in regiam, et presidentibus Imperatoribus una cum Episcopis, lectis et approbatis, et subscripserunt Imperator, quam mater ejus Paul. Diacon. misit lib. 2. in an. 827. conf.*

o Conc. Nic. 2. a  
Act. 1. pa. 300.  
p Epist. Hadr.  
Pape ad Imp.  
lecta in Com.  
Nic. 2. Act. 2.  
in fine Epist.  
q Et veluti præ-  
sentes genibus  
advoluti, et corâ  
vestigia pedum  
volutando. Ibid.  
r Dominus psssi-  
mus Constantino  
et Irene Hadria-  
nus servus ser-  
vorum Dei. In-  
script. Ep. Haar.  
f Synodus illa  
(Nicena) mulie-  
rem Institutricem  
sic Doltricem  
habuisse perhibe-  
tur, quod non  
solum divina le-  
gis documentis,  
sed ipsius natu-  
ra lege inhi-  
bitur. Car. magni  
liber dict. Capitu-  
lar e de non a-  
dorand. Imag.  
lib. 3. ca. 13. A-  
liud est matrem  
familias do mesi-  
cos erudire, aliud  
Antiphitis sine  
omni Ecclesiasti-  
co ordine, vel  
publica Synodo  
docentem inter-  
esse. Ibid.  
r Quod o, us ag-  
gressus sum cum  
côbitibus Sacer-  
dotum, non arro-  
gantia superci-  
lio, sed zelo Dei  
et veritatis stu-  
dio. Carol. mag.  
prefatio, et Cap.  
ultimum illius  
libri fuisse Caro-  
li agnoscat Had-  
rian in sua Epist. 3.  
ca. 25.  
p. 281. a.  
u Libri Carolini  
scripsi videntur  
in Concilio Frâ-  
cosfordiensi. Bell.  
lib. 2. de Conc. ca.  
8. § Primo quis.  
x Hadr. Epist. 3.  
ca. 53.



i Magnificentissimi  
 simi praesides  
 dixerunt Ait. 9.  
 § Letta.  
 k Repugnanti-  
 bus Apostolicis lega-  
 tis, utpote quod  
 sententia Rom.  
 Pontificum con-  
 demnati audiri  
 iterum non debe-  
 rent. Bar. an.  
 869. nu. 27.  
 l. Advocatur  
 cum Photio Episc-  
 copi quoque  
 Photiani, quod  
 nisi fiat, litteram  
 in hac Synodo  
 scribemus nul-  
 lam. Verba Lu-  
 dic. sec. in Cōc. 8  
 Ait. 4. pa. 883. b  
 m Verba Baha-  
 nis in Conc. 8.  
 citata a Nicb.  
 Cusan. lib. 3.  
 Conc. 8. ca. 20.  
 n Conc. 8. Ait. 6.  
 verba sunt Me-  
 tropolite Cesa-  
 rienfis, pa. 886. b  
 o Ait. 8. p. 893. a

17. For that which they call the eighth generall Councell, both the Emperours Deputies are called Presidents<sup>i</sup>; and in the sixt, se-  
 venth, eighth, and tenth actions it is expressly said, *Presidentibus Impe-*  
*ratoribus, the Emperours being Presidents*; yea, and both of them by their  
 very actions declared their Presidencie. The Popes Legate<sup>k</sup> would  
 not have permitted *Photius* and his Bishops to bee heard; the Empe-  
 rours Deputies over-ruled<sup>l</sup> them, as was fit, in that matter; yea, they  
 said to the Photian Bishops, *Imperator<sup>m</sup> jubet et vult, the Emperours*  
*will, pleasure, and command is, that you should speake in your owne cause*.  
 Of the Emperour they intreat liberty to defend themselves, *Rogamus*  
*domine<sup>n</sup> Imperator; we beseech you, our Lord and Emperour, that without in-*  
*terruption we may defend our cause*: When the bookes of *Photius* were  
 brought into the Synod, and burned in the midst thereof, this was  
 done, *volens ut<sup>o</sup> Basilias<sup>o</sup>, the Emperour commanding it*, and many the  
 like.

18. Now these eight are all which are accounted by them in the  
 number of generall and approved Councils, for the space of more  
 than a thousand years after Christ: Of al which seeing it is now cleare,  
 that they were both called by Imperiall authoritie, and governed by  
 Imperiall Presidencie, it hence appeareth, that as by the warrant of  
 the Scriptures, and example of the ancient Church before Christ, so  
 also by the continued practice of the whole Catholike Church, for  
 a thousand years together, these rights of calling and ordering gene-  
 rall Councils doe belong, and were acknowledged to belong onely  
 to Kings and Emperours; they called and commanded the Bishops,  
 the Bishops came at that call and command: they governed the as-  
 semblies in those Councils, all the Bishops (without murmuring or  
 so much as once contradicting) willingly submitted themselves to  
 that Imperiall government. And by this may now easily be discerned  
 wherein the lawfulnessse or unlawfulnessse of any Synod consisteth:  
 For wheresoever to Imperiall calling, and Imperiall Presidencie,  
 there is added the rightfull use of that Imperiall authoritie, in seeing  
 liberty, freedome, diligent discussion of the causes, and all due syno-  
 dall order preserved in any generall Synod, the same is, and ought to  
 bee truly called a generall lawfull Councell: But what generall  
 Councils soever have beene heretofore, or shall bee at any time  
 hereafter, either assembled by any other than Imperiall, and regall  
 authority, or governed for the observing of synodall order, by any o-  
 ther than Imperiall Presidencie, or misgoverned by the abuse there-  
 of, they all are, and are to bee esteemed for no other than generall un-  
 lawfull Councils.

19. Suffer mee here to propose some examples of each kinde,  
 partly in the ancient, partly in the later times of the Church: In the  
 order of lawfull generall Councils, principally, and by a certaine ex-  
 cellency above all the rest, are the five first approved Councils to bee  
 reckned: The first at *Nice*, the second at *Constantinople*, the third at  
*Ephesus*, the fourth at *Chalcedon*, the fift at *Constantinople* in the time of  
*Iustinian*; unto these the *Sardicane*, and that at *Constantinople* under  
*Mennas*, are to bee added, like two Appendant Synods; the former  
 to that at *Nice*, the later to that at *Chalcedon*: For the sixt, which was  
 held

held at *Constantinople* in the time of *Constantinus Pogonatus*, I am out of doubt, and doe firmly hold it to have beene both generall and lawfull: But I mention it apart by reason of that scruple touching the Canons thereof, concerning which I intend, if ever I have opportunity, to make a severall tract by it selfe. For their second *Nicene*, and the next unto it, to wit, that at *Constantinople*, in the time of *Basilus* and *Hadrian* the second, besides that there are just exceptions against their lawfulness, in regard of the proceedings used therein, it may be justly doubted whether either of them may be esteemed generall: specially considering that the Councell at *Frankford* utterly condemned that second *Nicene*, and decreed that it should not be called a generall Synod: and in very like manner did the Councell at *Constantinople*, held in the time of Pope *Iohn* the eighth, (or as some call him the ninth,) the next successor to *Hadrian* the second, condemn that Councell which they call the eighth, held in the time of *Hadrian* the second. Now although by the judgements of these two Councils, those other which they reckon for the seventh and eighth be wholly repealed, and that most justly; yet if the authority of these Synods were omitted, there are so many and so just exceptions against the two former, that I am out of doubt perswaded, that neither of them ought to stand in the order of generall lawfull Councils: nor will any, I suppose, judge otherwise, who shall impartially examine the Acts of them, & compare them with the histories of those times. If any at all after the sixt be to be ranked in the number of generall and lawfull Councils, I would not doubt to make it evident, if ever I should proceed so farre in this argument about Councils, that the Councell held at *Constantinople* in the time of *Constantinus Iconomachus* (whom they in contempt have with no small token of their immodesty nicknamed *Copronimus*) that this ought to be judged the seventh; that at *Frankford* the eighth; and that at *Constantinople*, which even now I mentioned, held in the time of Pope *Iohn* the eighth, (or as some call him, the ninth) the ninth of that order. For both the generality of all these three is by the best Writers acknowledged; and all of them were called by Imperiall authority, governed by Imperiall presidency, and that in a lawfull, free, and synodall manner; as, if ever I come to handle the Councils of those times, I purpose to explicate. This rather for this time I thinke needfull to observe: that as a Councell may be generall, and yet not lawfull, so may one be both generall and lawfull, and yet erroneous in the decrees thereof: which one point rightly observed, shewes an exceeding difference betwixt those five first generall Councils, with the *Sardicene*, and that under *Menas*, and all the rest which follow the sixt Synod. The former which were all held within the six hundred yeares after Christ, in the golden ages of the Church, are wholly, and in every decree and Canon, orthodoxall, and golden Councils, no drosse, nor dramme of corrupt doctrine could prevaile in any one of them: and so they are, and ever since they were held, were esteemed not onely generall and lawfull, but in every part and parcell of their decrees, holy and orthodoxall Councils, approved by all Catholikes, and by the whole Ca-

p Synodus quæ  
ante paucos an-  
nos sub Irene &  
Constantino con-  
gregata, & ab  
ipsis non solum  
septima verum etiã  
universali e-  
vas appellata ne-  
nes septima nec  
universali ha-  
beretur, dicere-  
tur, quasi su-  
pervacua in to-  
tum ab omnibus  
(in Conc. Fran-  
cofordensi) ab-  
dicata est. Aim.  
lib. 4. ca. 87. Si-  
milis habet Ado  
Vien. in Chron.  
Hincm. Rhen.  
in lib. contra  
Hincm. Laud.  
ca. 20. Regino;  
Hermann. Sira-  
bus Fuld. Egolf.  
Moser. & alii  
quam multi.  
q Quartus Con-  
cilii  
Constant. sub Jo-  
hann. 8. Superio-  
res synodus ad-  
versus Photianum  
habitas Nicholai  
& Hadriani  
temporibus ex-  
platis, & refutis  
imò ut de Syno-  
dorum numero  
sollentur suber-  
Præ. Turrian.  
lib. 6. 7. & 8.  
Synod. pa. 97.

tholike Church. But in all generall Councils which follow that fift, which were held after the 600. yeare, and in those times wherein dross and corruption began to prevaile above the gold, in them all there is some one blot or other wherewith they are blemished, and by reason whereof, although they be both generall and lawfull, yet are they not in every decree holy and orthodoxall, nor approved by the succeeding ages of the Church. Such in the sixt, is the 2. 52. and 53. Canons: in that under *Constantinus Iconomachus*, the 15. and 17. definitions: in that at *Frankford*, their condemning of the fact of the *Iconoclasts*, which (untill the decree for breaking them downe was repealed by the Councell at *Frankford*) was both pious, and warranted by the example of *Hezekias* dealing with the brazen serpent: In that under *John* the 8. their denying of the holy Ghost to proceed from the Son: And these examples which I have now named, are all the examples of generall and lawfull Councils, which as yet have beene held in the Church.

20. Wee come now to unlawfull Synods: wherein it is very memorable, that of such as are unlawfull by want of lawfull calling, there is no example in the ancient Church to bee found, nor more than a thousand yeares after Christ. All that time not any generall Councell assembled without lawfull warrant. The Bishops, no not they of Rome, were as yet growne to bee so insolent and headstrong as to come together without the Emperours *Mandatum*. And the very like might be said of such Synods as are unlawfull by want of Imperiall presidency. During all that time no Bishop, no not he of Rome, durst intrude himselfe into that Royalty and Imperiall right. As the Emperour called them all for a thousand yeares, so was he by himselfe or his deputies President in them all. But of such as were unlawfull by abuse of that Imperiall presidency, those ancient times doe yeeld abundant examples. Such among many was that at *Milane*, wherein *Constantinus*, who should have preserved order in all others, most of all in his owne selfe used such violent and tyrannous dealing, that the only Canon whereby he ruled the Synod, was his owne will: *Quod ego volo pro Canone sit*; My will shall be your law: and the onely reason whereby hee perswaded, was a most tyrannous *Dilemma*, *Aut subscribe, aut exulate*; either subscribe to *Arianisme*, or goe into banishment. Such againe was that *Ephesine Latrocinie*; When *Dioscorus* could not otherwise prevaile, hee brought the Proconsull guarded with clubs, with swords, with chaines, and by such meanes forced the Bishops to subscribe to blankes, and to the heresie of *Eutiches*; such fraud, violence, and unjust proceedings, whereby all liberty was taken away, made that Synod, though lawfully called, and having a rightfull President, to be no other than a very *Latrocinie*, as it is usually and justly called. Of this same sort was the Councell at *Arimine*, at *Syrmium*, and divers more of the ancient Synods. But these are sufficient for examples in those ancient times: the unlawfulness of them all arising onely from the abuse of the Imperiall and lawfull authority, not for want of lawfull authority either to assemble them, or governe them being assembled.

1. *Athan.* in *Epist.* ad *solit.* vii.  
*agent.* pa. 228. b.  
 2. *Ibid.*  
 3. *Introduxerunt*  
*proconsulem cum*  
*multitudine*  
*magna, & cate-*  
*nus.* *Act.* *Conc.*  
*Ephes.* in *Conc.*  
*Chalc.* *Act.* 1. pa.  
 39. a. *Violenta*  
*facta est via, cum*  
*plaga.* *Minaba-*  
*tur nobis dam-*  
*natio, mine exi-*  
*ty tendebantur,*  
*milites cum su-*  
*stibus & gladiis*  
*instabant.* *ibid.*  
*Act.* 1. pa. 7. b.  
 4. *In pura cher-*  
*ta subscripsimus:*  
*ibid.* pa. 7. b.  
 5. *Ubi gladii &*  
*fustes, qualis sy-*  
*nodus?* *ibid.*  
 6. *Aliud Ephesti*  
*Concilium latro-*  
*num cogitur.*  
*Epist.* *Iustin.* ad  
 7. *Synod.* 2. 605. b



21. Let us come lower, and to later times, and then we shall have abundance of examples of all kindes of unlawfull Synods. Since the thousand yeare after Christ, there have beene ten which they honour with the specious titles of generall <sup>2</sup> and holy Councils. All of them held in the West, five at *Rome* in the *Laterane*; three in *France*, (two of them at *Lions*, the third at *Vienna*;) two in *Italy*, the one at *Florence*, the other, which is the last and worst of all, at *Trent*. For their generality it is not unknowne what just exceptions may bee taken against them. Seeing in foure <sup>b</sup> of them none, in the rest but very few of the Easterne Bishops were present, they ought rather to bee called partiall, than generall; Westerne, than Oecumenicall Synods. That the Greekes held them not for generall, both that speech of theirs in the Councell of *Florence* <sup>c</sup>, *Venio ad septimum & ultimum generale Concilium*: where they professe the second Nicene to be the last which they acknowledge for a generall Councell: and the words of Bellarmine do make evident; *Græci tantum recipiunt prima septem Concilia ut notum est*; It is a thing vulgarly knowne, that the Greeke Church receiveth none but the seven first for generall Councils. And yet if wee should admit them (as we may not) for generall, what more honor were it for them that they were generall, than for the Councell at *Ariminum*, at *Syrmiu*, at *Millane*, and the Ephesine Latrocine: the worst of all which is by many degrees, for sanctity and due synodall order, to bee preferred before the best of their ten. But besides this of their generality, there is another exception which can never bee removed, concerning their lawfulnessse. They all and every one of them are unlawfull Synods: and that by defect of all those conditions which are essentially required in all lawfull generall Councils.

22. Unlawfull first they are by want of lawfull calling and authority to assemble them: not one of them assembled by Imperiall, all by Papall and usurped authority. The Popes, saith Bellarmine <sup>e</sup>, have called more than twelve generall Councils: Of those, these which wee have named were ten. Of the first Laterane, which is the first of the ten, *Binus* <sup>f</sup> saith, *It was appointed, solius Pontificis autoritate, by the authority of the Pope alone*. Of the next, which was the second Laterane, wherein were present about a thousand Bishops, *It was Innocentius* <sup>g</sup> *will to congregate it*. Of the third at Laterane (which is also the third in order) *It was assembled, Papa autoritate* <sup>h</sup>, *by the authority of Pope Alexander*. Of the fourth Laterane, (the fourth also in order) wherein among many other like matters, Transubstantiation was first of all decreed, more than twelve hundred yeares after Christ, *Autoritate* <sup>i</sup> *Innocentij indicta esse indicat apertissime Encyclica epistola*, the Encyclicall Epistle doth most manifestly shew that it was appointed by the Popes authority. Of the fift, which was the former at *Lions*, This Synod was appointed and congregated, *A* <sup>k</sup> *solo Pontifice, by the Pope alone, and by his authority*. Of the sixt, which was the second at *Lions*, Pope Gregory *Indixit* <sup>l</sup> *hoc Concilium, appointed this Councell*. Of the seventh, which was at *Vienna*, Pope Clement <sup>m</sup> *indixit Concilium, appointed this Councell*. Of the *Florentine*, which is the eighth, This Synod was *ab* <sup>n</sup> *Eugenio indicta, ap-*

<sup>Bin. Not. in Conc. 2. Lugdun. (ex Blond.)</sup> p. 1495. a. <sup>Bin. (ex Tritem.)</sup> Not in Conc. Vien. 10. 3. Conc. pa. 1510. a. <sup>n</sup> Bin. Not. in Conc. Florent. 10. 4. pa. 495. b.

<sup>2</sup> Bin. in conc. suis Concil. & Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 5. & alij.  
<sup>a</sup> Tridentum vñ Germanicam effesse Italianam civitatem nemo est qui nesciat. Gravan. op. of. Conc. Trident. pa. 36.  
<sup>b</sup> Omnia quinquē alia Concilia generalia, quia nec à Græcis recipiuntur, cum ipsi non interverint, — nimis, Lugdunense sub Innocent. 4. Viennense sub Clemente 5. Constantinense, Lateranense sub Leone 10. & Tridentinum, Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 13. §. Denique Conc. 4. Flor. Sess. 5. p. 421. a. Sunt autem verba Alarici Episcopi, præclari Theologi, qui pro Græcis causam egit. ut liquet ex sess. 3. pa. 415. b.  
<sup>d</sup> Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 5. §. Ex his.  
<sup>e</sup> Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 13. §. Ad hæc.  
<sup>f</sup> Bin. Not. in Conc. Lateran. 1. §. Concilium. 10. 3. pa. 1317. a.  
<sup>g</sup> Quibus de causis Pontifex hanc Synodum congregatam voluerit, intelliges. Bin. Not. in Conc. Lateran. 2. pa. 1325. a.  
<sup>h</sup> Bin. Not. in id. Conc. pa. 1330. b.  
<sup>i</sup> Bin. Not. in Conc. Lateran. 4. pa. 1465. b.  
<sup>k</sup> Bin. Not. in Conc. Lugd. 1. 10. 3. pa. 1450. a.  
<sup>l</sup> 10. 3. pa. 1450. a. <sup>n</sup> Bin.

o Bin. Notis in  
Con. Later. 1. sub  
Leone 10. 10. 4.  
Conc. pa. 651.  
p Conc. Later.  
sub Leone 10.  
Sess. 11. p. 639. b  
q Hec est Hile-  
nagna nuper  
Tridentis obti-  
nuit. Respenc.  
com. in Epist. ad  
Tit. pa. 43.  
2 Pauli 3. Bulla  
indict. prefixa  
Act. Conc. Trid.

Scit tunc non  
solum Pontifex  
concilia indixe-  
rit, ut postea fa-  
ctum est. ratio-  
nes multa sunt.  
Bell. lib. 1. de  
Concil. ca. 13.  
5. Habemus.

vltmoe. Gentil.  
in Examina. Con.  
Trid. lib. 2. in  
iustis.

pointed by *Engenius*, at the intreaty of the Emperour. Of the ninth, which was the fift *Laterane*, This was appointed and assembled, *Authoritate* *o Iulij Papa*, by the authority of *Pope Iulius*: nor onely was it selfe so assembled, but it decreed (which was never done before) that all generall Councils ought to be so assembled. For the last (which is their faire *Helen* of *Trent*) the Popes Bull, whereby hee appointed, summoned, and assembled it, is set in the forefront of it; wherein the Pope saith, *Conuentum Mantua indiximus, we have appointed that this Council should be held at Mantua*; but afterwards he removed it to *Trent*.

23. Thus were all the ten assembled by Papall, nor one of them by Imperiall authority. For though some Emperours and Kings consented indeed unto some of them; as to the first *Laterane*, *Henry 5.* to that at *Vienna*, *Philip* of *France*, and so in some others; yet the consent of Emperours and Kings is not sufficient for holding a Council, the authority by which the Bishops are called and come together, must bee regall: which in all these, as *Bellarmino* truly teacheth, was onely pontificall. Againe, that very consent to hold those Councils which Kings then gave, was a servile consent, not Imperiall; nor was it free and willing, but coacted and extorted. They knew certainly by the dealing of *Pope Hildebrand* with *Henry* the fourth, what they might expect, if they withstood the Popes will, or wraisted with such a Giant: no lesse than the losse of their Crownes had beene the censure for denying to consent to what the Pope would have them: their consent was no other, but that by the Popes authority the Synod should be called and held, a consent that the Synod should be called by an unlawfull and usurped authority; even such a consent, as if a rightfull King being overcome by a Rebelle, should for feare of his life consent that the Rebelle should call and assemble a Parliament, and there enact what lawes himselfe listed. It is the authority by which those Councils were gathered, not by whose consent they were gathered; of which we doe now enquire. The authority whereby they were assembled was onely in the Pope, though to that authority Emperours and Kings consented: and as they are not a little brag that the Pope could doe such worthy acts by his authority; so are we so farre from denying him to have done this, that wee willingly professe the same: but withall doe affirme, which inevitably ensues thereof, that even for this very cause all those Councils are unlawfull, because they were called by Papall, and not by Imperiall authority. This demonstrates them to have assembled without lawfull authority, to have beene nothing else than so many great Routs and Riots in the Church, so many tumultuous and disorderly Conventicles, so much more odious both in the sight of God and men, as those who tumultuously and without authority convented, should have beene patternes of piety, obedience, and order unto others.

24. Yea and this very exception which may equally be opposed against them all, was most justly taken (to omit the rest) against their *Trent* Riot, when it was congregated by that Papall and usurped authority: The King of England gave this as a reason of his refusall to send

send to it, because the right to call Councils belonged to Kings and Emperours, *nullam vero esse potestatem penes Pontificem*, but the Pope had no authority to call or assemble a Council. The French King writ a letter to them at *Trent*, and the superscription was, *Conventui Tridentino*: The Fathers stormed and snuffed a long while at that, disdaining that the King should write *Conventui*, and not *Councilio*, and hardly were they perswaded to read his letter: At last, when credence and audience was obtained for *James Aimiot* his Legate, he signified before all the *Trent* Fathers, that the King protested and published to all, (as also before he had done at *Rome*) that he accounted not that assembly *pro Oecumenico & legitimo Concilio*, sed *pro privato Conventu*, not for a generall Council, but for a private Convent, gathered together for the private benefit and good of some few; adding, *se suosque subditos nullo vinculo ad parendum his qua in eo decreta fuerint obstrictos iri*, that he and his subjects would not be tyed by the decrees thereof: exhorting further that this his protestation might be recorded among the Acts of their Synod, and that all Christian Kings might have notice thereof. The Electours<sup>a</sup> and Princes of *Germany* being assembled at *Nurimberge*, when *Zacharias Delphinus*, and *Franciscus Commendonius* the Popes Legates came to warne them in the Popes name<sup>v</sup> to come, or send to the Council of *Trent*, returned this answer unto them, *Mirantur illustrissimi Electores & Principes*, the most illustrious Electours and Princes doe wonder, that the Pope would take upon him, *Celsitudinibus suis Concilij indictionem obtrudere*, to obtrude to their Celsitude his appointment of a Council, and that he durst call them to *Trent*; adding, wee would have both the Pope and you his Legates to know, that wee acknowledge no such authority in the Pope, and we are certainly perswaded by the undoubted testimonies both of Gods law and mans, *Concilij indicendi jus Pontificem Romanum non habere*, that the Pope hath no authority and right to appoint, call, or assemble a Council. Thus they, whose answer is at large explained in their *Gravamina*<sup>z</sup>, where the first reason of their rejecting the *Trent* assembly is this, *quod ea illegitime, & contra manifestum jus indicta sit*, because it was appointed and gathered unlawfully, & against manifest right, seeing the Pope who called it, hath no authority to summon or call a Council: Of the same judgement were other Princes. When *Hieronimus Martinengus*<sup>a</sup> was sent as Legate from the Pope, to call some out of *England* to that *Trent* assembly in the time of the late Queene of renowned and blessed memory; *Belgio in insulam trajicere prohibuit*, she would not suffer him to set foote in her dominion about such businesse: *Nec<sup>b</sup> diversum ad Reges Daciae & Suetiae missus, responsum retulit*, and the Kings of *Denmarke* and *Swetia* gave the like answer, that the Pope had no right to call a Council. So justly did they dislike and contemne the going to that Synod, even for this cause, and that most justly, esteeming it for no other than a Conventicle, or unlawfull assembly.

25. Said I unlawfull? that is too soft and mild a word: that, and all the other nine with it, by reason of that Papall calling, were unlawfull in the highest degree, even Antichristian. For the authority whereby those Synods were called, belonging in right to Emperours and

u Gent. in Exam. sess. 12. 66c.  
Trid. pa. 96. &  
Iob. Sleid. Comment. lib. 22. pa. 332. b. et seq.

x Epit. verum in orbe gest. sub Fera. 1. an. 1561. apud Scard. loc. 3. pa. 217. et seq.  
y Summus Pontifex sacrum Concilium Tridentini celebrandi auctoritate divinitus sibi tradita decrevit; nosq; ablegavit nuncios suos qui p<sup>o</sup> Pontificis nomine singulos conveniremus, et rogaremus ut ad Concilium hoc accederent. Ibid. z Gravam. oppo. sita Conc. Trid. causa 1. pa. 21. a Epit. verum in orbe gest. sub Fera. an. 1561. apud Scard. loc. cit.

b Ibid.



c. 1 Theſſ. 2. 4.

d Sup. ca. 13.

and Kings, and being tyrannically usurped by the Pope, as he by intruding himselfe into the Imperiall royalties, and lifting up himselfe above all the Vicegerents of God here in earth, *that is, above all that is called God*, did thereby proclame himselfe to bee that man of sinne, and display his Antichristian Banner: So on the other side, those Bishops and others, who came at his Papall call, and yeelded obedience to him, in such sort usurping, did, *eo ipso*, in that very act of theirs, receive the marke of the beast, and not onely consent, but submit themselves to his Antichristian authority, and fight under the very Ensignes and Banner of Antichrist: But of this point I have before<sup>d</sup> intreated, where I shewed, that all, even the best actions, (how much more then such tumultuous and turbulent attempts) when they are performed in obedience to the Pope, as Pope, that is, as a supreme Commander, are turned into impious and Antichristian rebellions against God.

e Placuit annis singulis per unamquamque Provinciam bis in anno Concilia celebrari. Conc. Nic. Can. 5.

f Quae ab Episcopis erant editae regulae Constantinus sua confirmabat et confirmabat auctoritate. Euseb. lib. 4. de vita Const. ca. 27.  
g Lib. 1. Cod. de Peter. jure enunc. et lib. 2. Decretal. tit. 23. ca. sicut noxius in Glossa.  
h Novell. 131. ca. 1.

26. This rather is needfull to bee here observed, that not onely generall, but even Provinciall or Nationall Synods are in all Christian Kingdomes to bee called onely by Imperiall, not at all by Papall or Episcopall authority; yea, and they are so called in every well ordered Church: For although there goe not forth a particular and expresse *Edit* or *mandatum* from Kings, to assemble them, yet so long as Kings or Emperours doe not expresse their will to the contrary, even that summons which is sent from Primates or other Bishops subject unto them, hath virtually and *implicitè* the Imperiall authority by which every such Synod is assembled: The reason whereof is this: The holy Nicene Councell decreed<sup>e</sup>, that for the more peaceable government of each Church, there should be two Provinciall Synods yearly held by every Primate. Those holy Fathers meant not (as the continuall practice throughout the whole Church doth explaine) so strictly to define that number of two, as that neither more, nor fewer might be kept in one yeare: But they judging that, for those times a competent and convenient number, they set it downe, but yet as an accidentall, ceremoniall, and therefore mutable order, if the necessitie and occasions of any Church should otherwise require. That which is substantiall and immutable in their Canon is, that Provinciall Synods shall be held by each Primate so often, and at such times as the necessity and occasions of their Church shall require: and the chiefe Iudge of that necessity and fitting occasions is no other than hee to whose sword and authority every Bishop is subject, and without whose consent first obtained, they may in no place of his Kingdome assemble together without the note of tumult and sedition. This Nicene Canon, as all the rest, when *Constantine*<sup>f</sup>, and other succeeding Emperours and Kings approved, (as who hath not approved that holy Councell?) they then gave unto it the force of an Imperiall law, according to the rule, *omnia & nostra facimus, quibus nostram impartimur auctoritatem*; we make that our owne Act, and our law which wee ratifie by our authoritie: And *Iustinian* more plainly expressed this, when he said: *h Sancimus vicem legum obtinere sanctas regulas*; we enact, that the holy Canons of the Church set downe in the former Councils, the Nicene, the *Constantinopolitane*,

*politane, Ephesine, and Chalcedon*, shall have the force, and stand in the strength of Imperiall lawes: By this Imperiall assent it is, that when the wisdom of Christian Emperours and Kings doth not otherwise dispose of calling Synods in their dominions, Primaries may call the same, two, or more, or fewer in any yeare, as necessitie shall perswade: but whensoever they call any, the same are called, assembled and celebrated by the force of that Imperiall authoritie, which Kings and Emperours have either given to that Nicene Canon, or which they in more explicate manner shall impart unto the Primates or Bishops in their Kingdomes.

27. Now if Provinciaall Councils may not, nor ever are lawfully held in Christian Kingdomes without this authority, how much lesse may generall and Oecumenicall, the occasions of which being rare and extraordinary, the calling also of them is extraordinary, and both for the time & place, meerly arbitrary, at the will of those who have Imperial or regal authority: To say nothing, how inconvenient it is even in civill government, and how dangerous unto Christian States, that all the Bish. of a Kingdome should leave their own Churches naked of their guides, and Pastours, and goe into farre and forraigne Countries, without the command of their Sovereigne Lords, especially goe at the command of an usurping Commander, and that also, if he require, though their owne Sovereignes shall forbid or withstand the same, of the mischief and danger whereof the example of *Becket*, among many like, may be a warning to all Kingdomes. But leaving that to the grave consideration of others, thus much now out of that which hath beene said, is evident, that seeing all those ten forenamed Synods were called and assembled by no other authority than Pontificall, and seeing lawfully assemble they could not, but onely by Imperiall, it hence clearly ensueth, that for defect of lawfull calling and assembling, they are all of them no other than unlawfull Councils: Againe, seeing no Synods are congregated in Christs name, but such as are assembled by him who hath from Christ authority to assemble them, which in Christian Kingdomes none hath, as wee have shewed, but onely Kings and Emperours: and seeing none of those ten were assembled by them, it hence further and certainly ensueth, that never one of those ten were gathered in Christs name, and if not in Christs, then sure in no other but in the name of Antichrist, and so all of them, in respect of their calling, not only unlawfull, but even Antichristian Councils.

28. After their calling consider their proceedings, for as those Councils were unlawfully assembled, so were they also unlawfull by defect of the other essentiall condition, which is, due and synodall order: for they all not onely wanted synodall freedome and order, but, which is worse, they wanted that which is the onely meanes to have synodall freedome and order observed in any generall Councell, and that is the Imperiall Presidencie: in none of them was the Emperour, in them all<sup>k</sup> the Pope was President: In the first *Laterane*, *Calistus*<sup>l</sup>, in the second, *Innocentius*<sup>m</sup> the second; in the third, *Alexander*<sup>n</sup> the third; in the fourth, *Innocentius*<sup>o</sup> the third; and the like might bee shewed

i Congregari in nomine Christi nihil aliud est, quam ab eo congregari, qui habet a Christo auctoritatem congregandi. Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 17. § At hoc k Addamus (bis 8. primis) reliqua generalia Concilia, in quibus omnibus sunt controversie Pontifex Rom. presedit. Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 20 § Si ergo. l Papa Calixtus 2. curam innumera multisudine Cleri et populi eidem Concilio (Viennensem) nominat Vesper. diceret Lateranensem, ut et Bin. agnoscat notis suis in illud Conc. presedit. Abb. Vesper. ad an. 1119. et hunc Concilio presedit Pontifex. Bin. notis suis ad id Conc. pa. 13 17. b m Synodus maxima Rome. presedente summo Pontifice Junatio celebratur. Otho Frising. lib. 7. ca. 23. n Omnes scriptes salentur eidem Concilio Pontificem Romanum presedis. se. Bin. Not. in Cons. Later. 3. § Oecumenicum 10. 3. pa. 13 51. o Ei Pontifex Rom. presedit. Bin. not. in Conc. Later. 4. 10. 3. Con. pa. 1466 b

p Bell. lib. 1. de  
Con. ca. 20. § Si  
ergo.

q Hos ut se ne-  
fando jure ju-  
rando adstrin-  
gerent, adegit,  
puerum enim  
mastravit, jura-  
mentaq; in illo  
super ejus  
visceribus, eandem  
ipse cum alijs  
comedit. Dio  
Cass. lib. 37.  
r Catilinam lux-  
uria primum, tu  
egestas in nefaria  
Concilia oppri-  
menda patrio  
impulere, Sena-  
tum confodere,  
totam rempub.  
funditus tollere,  
et quicquid nec  
Hannibal videri  
optasse.  
L. Flor. lib. 4.  
ca. 1.

s Ego Nic. ab hac  
hora fidelis ero  
S. Petro et Eccle-  
siae Romanae do-  
minique meo Pa-  
pe. Papatum  
adjutor ero ad  
defendendum.  
Forma est jura-  
menti secundum  
quam jurant E-  
piscopi et bodie  
omnes recipien-  
tes dignitatem  
a Papa. Extra.  
de jur. jur. ca.  
Ego N. lib. 2. tit.  
24. ca. 4.

t Aug. lib. 2. cōt.  
Ep. Parm. ca. 13.

u Quid excogi-  
tare verum  
vel verissi-

mile possunt, quin-  
bus non vel Rex  
vel Caesar, non  
populus, non cle-  
rus, non genera-  
lis Synodus, non  
deniq; tota Ec-  
clesia dicere po-  
test, cur ita fa-  
cis? Cl. 2. spen.  
in cap. 1. ad Ti-  
tum. pa. 76.

x De quo supra  
cap. Ego N. Ex-  
tra. de jur. jur.

shewed in the rest; but that *Bellarmines* words may ease us of that la-  
bour, who speaking of all those ten Councils, saith *p*, *In eis omnibus si-  
ne Controversia Pontifex Rom. praesedit*, the Pope without doubt was Presi-  
dent in them all.

29. Nor was this an Episcopall Presidencie a preheminance only,  
& precedence before other Bishops in the Synod, such as any Bish. to  
whō the Emp. pleased to confer that dignity, might lawfully enjoy; &  
when he gave it to none by name, it then by his tacit consent or permi-  
ssion fell, as it were by devolution upon the chiefe Bishop that was  
present in the Councell: Such a Presidencie, though it bee not due to  
the Pope, seeing in the ancient Councils hee neither had it, nor grud-  
ged that other should have it, yet are wee not unwilling to allow  
that unto him, if contenting himselfe therewith hee would seeke no  
more: But the Presidencie which hee now desires, and in all those ten  
Councils usurped, is meerely Imperiall; the Presidencie of governing  
the Synod, and ordering it by his authority and power, the very same  
which in all the generall Councils, for a thousand yeares after Christ,  
the Emperour held, and had it as one of his Royalties and Imperiall  
rights, none of all the Catholike Bishops in those Councils ever so  
much as contradicting, much lesse resisting the same: For any Bi-  
shops, most of all for the Pope, to take upon them such a Presidencie  
utterly overthrows all liberty and order in Councils; for by it all the  
Bishops are to be kept in awe and order; and the Pope, who of all o-  
ther is most exorbitant, and farthest out of square, ought by this to be  
curbed, & reduced into order: Even as when *Catiline* took upon him  
to bee the Ruler and guide to his assembly, and a punisher of disor-  
ders among them, though all the rest willingly submitted themselves,  
and that with a solemne oath, to bee ordered by him in their acti-  
ons; yet for all this order they were no free Romane Senate, but a  
Conjuration of Conspirators, striving to oppresse the Romane  
State, liberties, and ancient lawes: Right so it is in these Synods, when  
the Pope, who is the Lord of misrule, and Ring-leader of the Conspi-  
rators, takes upon him this Presidencie, to order Councils, though  
the rest not onely consent, but binde themselves by a sacred oath, to  
be subject to his authoritie; this very usurpation of such Presidencie  
doth, *eo ipso*, exclude and banish all liberty & synodall order, & makes  
their assemblies meere Conjurations against the truth, and ancient  
faith of the Church.

30. How could it now be chosen, but that whatsoever heresie the  
Pope with the faction of his Catilinarie Conspiratours embraced,  
should in such Councils prevaile against the truth? The Imperiall au-  
thority was the onely hedge or pale to keepe the Pope within his  
bounds; that being once removed, he said, he did, he decreed what he  
listeth. The rule of his Regiment was now the old Canon of *Constan-  
tius*, *Quod ego volo pro Canone sit*: the prooffe of all their decrees was  
borrowed from their predecessors, the old *Donatists*: *Quod volumus  
sanctum est*. Nor Emperours, nor Bishops, none might controule him  
or say unto him, *Domine, cur ita facis*? The Bishops were tyed to him  
by an oath, to defend the Papacy, (that is, his usurped authority)  
and



and defend it, *contra omnes homines*, against all that should wag their tongues against it. The Emperours and Kings saw how *Hildebrand* had used, and in most indigne manner misused *Henry* the 4. how *Alexander* the third had insolently trodden on the necke of *Fredericke*: what could they, nay what durst they doe, but either willingly stoop and prostrate themselves, or else be forced to lye downe at the Popes feet, and say unto him, *Tread on us, O thou Lion of the Tribe of Judah*; and according as it is written, *Set thy foot super Aspidem & Basiliscum*. Could there possibly be any freedome or order in such Synods, where the onely meanes of preserving freedome and order was banished? Might not the Pope in such Councils doe and decree whatsoever either himselfe, his will, or faction would suggest unto him? Say they had neither swords, nor clubs, nor other like instruments of violence in those Synods: they needed none of them: This Papall presidency was in stead of them all. It was like the club of *Hercules*, the very shaking of it was able, and did affright all, that none, no not Emperours durst deale against it. The removing of the Imperiall presidency made such a calme in their Synods, that without resistance, without any need of other further violence, the Pope might overway whatsoever he desired.

31. And truly it may bee easily observed by such as attentively reade the Ecclesiasticall stories, that together with the standing or fall of the Empire, either the ancient faith or heresies prevailed in the Church. So long as the Emperour being Christian, retained his dignity and Imperiall authority, no heresie could long take place, but was by the Synodall judgement of Oecumenicall Councils maturely suppressed: the faction of no Bishop, no not of the Pope, being able to prevaile against that soveraigne remedy. But when once *Gregorie* the second, *Zachary*, and their succeeding Popes to *Leo* the third, had by most admirable and unexplicable fraud & subtilty, clipt the wings and cut the sinewes of the Easterne Empire; themselves first seizing upon the greatest part of *Italy*, by the meanes of *Pipin*, and then erecting a new Empire in the West, the Imperiall authority being thus infringed, the Easterne Emperour not daring, the Westerne in regard of the late curtesie received from the Pope, being not willing, and neither of them both being able now to match and justle with the Pope; this which was the great let and impediment to the Popes faction, and the discovering of the man of sinne being now removed, there was no meanes to keepe out of the Church the heresies which the Pope affected: then the *Cataracts* of heresies being set open, and the depths of the earth, nay of the infernall pit being burst up, heresies rusht in, and came with a strong hand into the Church, and those hereticall doctrines which in six hundred yeares and more could never get head, passing as doubtfull and private opinions among a few, and falling but as a few little drops of raine, grew now unto such an height and outrage, that they became the publike and decreed doctrines in the Westerne Church. The Pope once having found his strength in the cause of Images, (wherein the first triall was made thereof) no fanatic nor dotage was so absurd for which he could not after that com-

y Alexander  
Imperatori iussit  
ut se humi pro-  
sterneret, et Im-  
peratoris collum  
pede comprimens  
ait, Scriptum est,  
Super Aspidem  
et Basiliscum  
ambulabis.  
Nauclan. 1179

z Ab an. 730  
ad an. 800.

mand, when he listeth, the judgement of a generall Councell, Transubstantiation, Proper Sacrifice, the Idoll of the Masse, (to which not *Moloch* nor *Baal* is to be compared) their Purgatorian fire, their five new-found proper Sacraments, condignity of workes, yea Supererogation, and an armie of like heresies assailed and prevailed against the truth. The Imperiall authority being laid in the dust, and trampled under the sole of the Popes foot, no meanes was left to restrain his enormous designs, or hinder him in Councils, to doe and define even what he listeth. And as the Imperiall authority which he so long time had oppressed, is in any kingdome more or lesse restored, and freed from his vassalage; the other heresies which arose from the ruine and decay thereof, are more or lesse expurged out of that Kingdome, and the ancient truth restored therein: Yea and still, though but by insensible degrees, shall hee and his authority waste and consume, till not onely all the ten<sup>b</sup> hornes of the Beast (that is, all the Kings whose authority he hath usurped, and used as his hornes to push at Gods Saints) shall hate the Whore, that Romish *Babylon*, and make her desolate and naked, and burne her with fire; but till himselfe also being despised and contemned of his owne lovers, shall together with his adherents be utterly abolished, and cast into that Lake of Gods wrath.

32. You see now how unlawfull those Synods are by reason of the defect of Imperiall presidency: you will perhaps demand whether by the want thereof there happened any particular disorder in them, or ought contrary to freedome and synodall order: whereunto I might in a word answer, that there neither was, nor could there becoming at all done in any of those ten Synods with freedome and synodall order. For though otherwise their proceedings had beene never so milde, temperate and equall, yet even for that one defect of Imperiall presidency, and excluding the same, whatsoever they did was disorderly, and they all nothing but synods of disorder. But yet for further satisfaction of that question, let us (omitting all the rest) consider among very many, some few particulars concerning their youngest and dearest baby of *Trent*; Was that equall dealing in *Paul* the 3. at the beginning of his *Trent* assembly, to conspire<sup>c</sup> and take secret counsell with the Emperour to make warre against the Protestants, and root them out of the world? The Italian Franciscan in his Sermon before *Ferdinand*, stirring up both him and others to this butchery, *Exere vires tuas*, plucke up your spirit and strength, and root out that pestiferous kinde of men, *nefas enim est*, for it is unlawfull to suffer them any longer to looke upon the light: neither say that you will doe it, it must be done even now at this present, and without any delay. Thus did he give the watchword, and sound an alarme to their intended Massacre: whereupon there ensued *bellum<sup>e</sup> cruentum & calamitosum*, a bloody and cruell warre against the Protestants: concerning which divers of the Princes of *Germanie* said in their Letters to the Emperour, *Wec<sup>f</sup>* shall so answer that every man may understand, both that injury is done to us, and that you doe undertake this warre *Romani Antichristi & impij Concilij Tridentini impulsu*, at the instigation

<sup>a</sup> Theff. 1. 8.

<sup>b</sup> Apoc. 17. 12.  
16.

<sup>c</sup> Cum Concilio jam haberi inciperet, Imperator et Pontifex clanculum una, de armis ad Protestantem domandis suscipiendis concilium inter se inierunt. Gen. Exam. Trident. Conc. sess. 3. nu. 5 ad 10b. Sleid. Comment. lib. 16. an. 1545. e Gen. loc. cit. nu. 6. f Sleid. Comm. lib. 17. an. 1546

of the *Romane Antichrist*, and the impious Council at *Trent*, that the doctrine of the Gospell, and the liberty of *Germany* may bee oppressed: Was this *Concilium pacis*, or rather *Concilium sanguinis*, a conspiracie not onely against the faith, but against the life of *Catholikes*? Was it fit his Holinesse should play *Judas* part, pretend love and emendation of the faith, when he intended murder, and an utter extirpation of the servants of God? Could there be freedom for them at *Trent* in the Popes dominion, when they might not be suffered to breathe or live at home in their owne free Cities and States? Was not this a stratagem unknowne in the time of the Council at *Millane* and *Arimine*, to invite *Catholikes* to the Synod, and promise liberty and free access, but provide that they shall have no leisure, not so much as come to the Council?

33. What equity or freedom could there either be, or be expected in that Council, wherein the Pope, who is the capitall enemy of the *Catholikes*, took upon him to be their Iudge, yea, when himselfe who was *reus*, guilty of heresie, besides other crimes, and who should have beene judged first of all, tooke upon him to bee supreme Iudge in his owne cause? Let *Catiline* be held for such a Iudge betwixt the Senate and himselfe; it is not to bee doubted but *Tully*, and all who stood for the liberty of their City and Country, shall be proscribed and condemned as rebels; and *Catiline* with his faction decreed to be the onely true Citizens, the onely men fit to rule the Empire. It was the just exception<sup>h</sup> which those 47. *Catholike Bishops* that stood for *Athanasius*, tooke against the Council at *Tyre*, wherein hee was condemned, that *Eusebius* and *Theoginus*, the mortall enemies of *Athanasius*, were his Iudges in that Synod; *Lex autem Dei inimicum neque testem, neque judicem esse vult*; but the law of God prohibits a mans enemy to be a witnesse, much more to be his Iudge. The very same exception took<sup>i</sup> *Chrysostome* against *Theophilus* and the Synod with him. *Theophilus*, faith he, hath called us unto judgement, before hee hath purged himselfe of the crimes objected against him, *quod contra omnes Canones & Leges est*, which is against all lawes and Canons: and againe, it is not fit that *Theophilus* should judge us, *qui ipse reus est, inimicus & hostis, who is himselfe guilty or accused of crimes, and is also our enemy*. Thus *Chrysostome*. A matter of such equity, that both Pope *Nicholas*<sup>k</sup> the first, and *Celestine* the third say, *Ipsa ratio dicat*, Common reason doth teach, that those who are ones enemies, ought not to be their Iudges. The Pope then being a professed enemy of Protestants can be no lawfull or competent Iudge of them: and being himselfe *reus*, called into question for heresies, can be no lawfull Iudge in his owne cause, and in those very heresies whereof he is accused. And truly the answer whereby *Bellarmin*<sup>l</sup> thought to avoid this most just exception against their *Trent* Council and the rest, doth much more confirme the equity thereof: He confesseth that this holds<sup>m</sup> in all, save onely in the supreme Iudge. He onely may be Iudge in his owne cause, and against his enemies also, all else must stand to the judgement of others. The interpretation is true, but in the application of this to the Pope, there he faileth: for hee intends the Pope to be that supreme Iudge; than which there cannot be devised a more

g *Tridentum* *bera aut imperij civitas non est, sed membrum principum Pontificia sacrosancta. Grav. oppos. Trident. Conc. pa. 37.*

h *Albanus*. *2. pol. 2. §. Non arbitramur. p. 216*  
i *Chrys. Epist. ad Innocent. Pa. pam to. 1. Conc. post Epist. 27.*  
k *Quia suspecti et inimici, iudices esse non debeant, et ipsa ratio dicat et plurimis probatur exemplis. Epist. 8. Nich. 1. §. Igitur quia.*  
l *Ipsa ratio dicat, quia suspecti et inimici iudices esse non debeant. Extr. de Appel. ca. Secundo requiritur.*  
m *Quod dicant, non debere eundem esse iudicem, et partem, dico habere locum in privatis bonis, non in principe supremo. Ille enim semper est summus Iudex etiam si cum ipso litigetur. Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 21. §. Tertius.*



n. Matth. 18. 17  
Hoc quod Chris-  
tus dixit, Dic  
Ecclesie, omnes  
homines com-  
prehendi, &  
quod Petrus &  
ejus successores  
illa auctoritate  
comprehendatur  
ostendit Paulus  
qui in faciem ve-  
nit Cepha :  
probat etiam hoc  
auctoritas uni-  
versalis Eccle-  
sie, &c. Respon-  
sio Synodalis  
Concilii Basiliensis, pa.  
105. a.  
o Conc. 6. act. 13  
Epistolas Hono-  
rii omnimodo  
abjiciuntur &  
tanquam anima  
noxia execra-  
mur, pa. 67. a.  
& Exclamave-  
runt universi,  
Honorio hereti-  
co Anathema.  
Conc. 6. act. 26.  
pa. 79. a.  
p. Deceffamur  
Sergium, Hono-  
rium, &c. Conc.  
Nic. 1. act. 7. p.  
386. b.  
q. Quamvis Hono-  
rium post mor-  
tem ex albemate  
sit affectus, ma-  
nifestum tamen  
est illum de ha-  
eresi fuisse accu-  
satum, qua sola  
in causa licet in-  
ferioribus de  
superioribus ju-  
dicare, Conc. 6.  
act. 7. pa. 89. 1. b  
& Potestati Ec-  
clesie quilibet  
cujuscunque di-  
gnitatis, etiam si  
papalis existat,  
obedire tenetur  
in his que perti-  
nent ad fidem.  
Conc. Constant.  
sess. 4.  
F. Veritas hoc  
quod Concilium  
est supra Papam  
est veritas fidei  
Catholice. Conc. Basiliensis, sess. 33.  
t. Peccata eorum (Papam) super dicta fuerunt Ecclesie, et ab Ecclesia puniuntur, et qui non  
audierint Ecclesiam fuerunt bapismi et Eucharistie, ut legitur de Anastasio et Liberio, Resp. Synodalis Conc. Basiliensis, pa.  
105. a. et pa. eadem, enumerat Job. 12. et alios, u. Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. 6. 21. §. Demum.

base begging of the question, and most speciall controversie. That he is not supreme, we unavoydably prove by the words of Christ, *Dic Ecclesia*: by the judgement of this fift Councell, which judged and condemned both the Popes *Cathedrall Constitution* for hereticall, and *Vigilius* himselfe for an heretike: and in saying the fift Councell, it is as much as if I said, by the judgement of the whole Catholike Church, all the former Councils consenting in faith with this fift, and all that follow it approving the judgement thereof, untill their *Laterane Synod*. The same is further proved by the sixt<sup>o</sup> generall Councell, which judged and condemned Pope *Honorius* for an Heretike, by that which they call the seventh, which also condemned *Honorius*; by the next, which they account the eighth, wherein it is decreed, that in the case of heresie the Pope may be judged; (and that is the very case whereof the Pope is now accused;) by the Councils of *Constance*, and *Basil*, in both which it is decreed to be a doctrine of the Catholike faith, that the Pope hath a superiour Iudge in the case both of heresie, schisme, and scandalous life: by the practice of the Church, in judging and deposing *Liberius*, and *Iohn* the 12. by the very words of *Bellarmino* himselfe, if the Bishops, faith he, in a Synod can convince the Pope of heresie, possunt eum judicare & deponere, they may judge and depose him. And if in any cause he have a superiour Iudge, then is he not supreme. Seeing then by all these, besides infinite moe, it is not onely proved, but demonstrated, that the Pope is not, nor ought to be held as supreme Iudge, but may in some causes be both judged, condemned, and deposed: and seeing by *Bellarmines* owne confession, none can be judge in his owne cause, or of his adversaries towards whom he professeth open enmity, but onely the supreme Iudge, it inevitably followeth upon the Cardinals owne words, besides evident reason, that the Pope neither was in the Councell of *Trent*, nor can be in any Councell a lawfull Iudge, either of Protestants, or in those causes which he then undertooke to judge, in which himselfe was a party and *Reus*; seeing then, he should be Iudge in his owne cause, which equity and reason, the law both divine and humane doe constantly prohibite.

34. Adde hereunto the judgement of the ancient and Catholike Church. I doe never reade, or almost remember the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, but with a kinde of amazement I admire the rare piety, prudence, integrity, moderation, and gravity of those most glorious Iudges, who supplying the Emperours place when he was absent, were the Imperiall Presidents in that Councell: Had they, or such like Presidents beene wanting at that time, it may justly be feared, considering the eagernesse and temerity, that I say not the insolency of the Popes Legates in that Synod, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* had proved a worse Latroeciny than the second *Ephesine* was. In that Councell both these causes now mentioned fell out, the one in *Dioscorus*, the other in *Athanasius* Bishop of *Paros*. *Dioscorus* came and sate down in his place among the other Patriarks & Bishops, as one who would be a Iudge in the causes proposed, for in ancient Councils there was

Peccata eorum (Papam) super dicta fuerunt Ecclesie, et ab Ecclesia puniuntur, et qui non audierint Ecclesiam fuerunt bapismi et Eucharistie, ut legitur de Anastasio et Liberio, Resp. Synodalis Conc. Basiliensis, pa. 105. a. et pa. eadem, enumerat Job. 12. et alios, u. Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. 6. 21. §. Demum.

a different \* place, and seats for the Bishops, who judged and gave sentence in the Councell, and for others who were actors, whether plaintiffs and accusers, or *Rei*, and accused. Now because *Dioscorus* himselfe was the partie who was called into question, and to be judged; and equity forbids a man to bee Iudge in his owne cause: The Councell, and by name the Popes Legates, (to whom the rest therein assented) tooke this just exception thereat, and said, *Non patimur*, we cannot indure this wrong to be done, *ut ille sedeat qui iudicandus advenit*; that *Dioscorus*, who is to bee judged, sit as a Iudge in his owne cause; upon which most just and equall motion, the glorious Iudges, who were Presidents for order, commanded *Dioscorus* to remove <sup>2</sup> from the Bench, as I may say, of Iudges, and to sit in the middle of the Church, which was the place both for the Accusers and *Rei*; and *Dioscorus* accordingly fate there, as the glorious Iudges had appointed: Vpon the very same ground of equitie did the religious Emperour command in the second *Ephesine* Synod, that if <sup>a</sup> any question or cause fell out to be debated concerning *Theodoret* (whom he commanded to be present) that then, *absque illo Synodum convenire*; the Synod should assemble & judge that cause without *Theodoret*; he should have no iudicatory power in his own cause: And the like he further commanded concerning that holy Bish. *Flavianus*: He & some others had before in the Synod at *Constantinople* beene Iudges against *Eutiches*, and condemned him. An higher, even that generall Councell at *Ephesus* (which proved a Latrocinie in the end) was called to examine <sup>b</sup> that judgment of *Flavianus* and the rest, whether it was just or no. The Emperour commanded <sup>c</sup> those who had beene Iudges of late, *in loco eorum esse qui iudicandi sunt*, now to bee in the place of *Rei*, such as were to bee judged. A demonstration, that if *Theodosius* or *Martian*, or such like worthy and equall Iudges as they were at *Chalcedon*, had been Presidents for order in their *Trent* assembly, the Pope, though hee had beene as just and orthodoxall as *Flavianus*, much more being in impiety and heresie farre superiour to *Dioscorus*, should not have beene permitted to sit among the Bishops of the Councell, nor have so much as one single decisive suffrage or any iudicatory power in his owne cause, much lesse have had such a supremacie of judgement, that his onely voyce and sentence should over-rule, and over-sway the whole Councell besides.

35. The other example is this: *Athanasius* Bishop of *Paros* being accused <sup>d</sup> of sundry crimes, was called to triall before a Provinciall Councell at *Antioch*, held by *Domnus* Bishop of that See, unto whose Patriarchall authority *Athanasius* was subject; when hee refused to come after three citations, hee was deposed by that Synod, and *Sabinianus* by the same authority, made Bishop of *Paros* in his roome. In the Councell at *Chalcedon* *Athanasius* came, complained of wrongfull extrusion, and desired of the generall Councell, that his Bishopricke might be restored unto him, pleading for his refusall to come to trial at the Synod at *Antioch*, nothing else but this <sup>e</sup>, that *Dionysius* who was the chiefe Iudge in that Synod, was his enemy; and therefore hee thought it not equall to be tried before him, though he was

x Eusebius et Theodoretus in ordine accusationis sedenti, sicut et vos in loco accusatorum sedetis. Conc. Chal. Act. 1. pa. 13. a. y Act. 1. Conc. Chal. pa. 5. a.

z Dioscoro secundum iustitiam gloriosissimum Iudicem, repositum in medio. ibid.

a Epist. Theodos. et Valent. ad Dioscorum extat in Actis Conc. Chal. Act. 1. pa. 5. b.

b Nunc vos constituit eos qui iudicaverant iudicetis. Eusebius dictum nomine Imper. in Conciliab. Ephes. recitatur vero in Conc. Chal. Act. 1. pa. 13. b. c Ibid.

d Conc. Chal. Act. 1. 4. per totum e Dicat Athanasius cur tunc de vocatus a Concilio Antiocheno, non occurrat. Athanasius dixit, Quoniam inimicus meus erat ipse qui iudicabat, et rogo hunc relegi, et veritate probari. ib. pa. 127. b. Solum quia suus inimicus esset ipse qui iudicabat, clamavit, a sancta Chal. Synodo ad causas illatas sibi examinandas referri vultur. Epist. 8 Nich. 1. 5 Veniamus;

his owne Patriarch. The glorious Iudges gave order that the accusations against *Athanasius* should within eight moneths bee examined by *Maximus* then Bishop of *Antioch*, and a Synod with him; and if he were found guilty of those crimes, or any other worthy deposition, he should for ever want the Bishopricke. But if either they did not within such time examine the cause, or examining it, finde the accusations untrue, that then the See of *Paros* should be restored unto *Athanasius*, as unjustly deposed; and that *Sabinianus* should remaine but a substitute unto him, untill *Maximus* could provide him of another Bishopricke. Thus ordered the secular Iudges, and the whole Councell of *Chalcedon* approved this sentence, crying out, *Nihil iustius, nothing is more just*, nothing is more equall, this is a just sentence, you judge according to Gods minde. O that once againe the world might bee so happy as to see one other such holy Councell as was this of *Chalcedon*, and such worthy Iudges to be Presidents thereof. All the *Anathemae* and censures of their Councell at *Trent*, where the Romane *Domnus* our capitall enemy was the chiefe, nay rather the onely Iudge, would even for this very cause be adjudged of no validity, nor of force to bind I say not other Churches, such as these of *Britany*, but not those very men who are otherwise subject to the Popes Patriarchall authority, as *Athanasius* was to *Domnus*. Such an holy Councell would cause a *melius inquirendum* to be taken of all their judgements and proceedings against the Saints of God: and unlesse they could justifie (which while the Sun and Moone endureth they can never) their slanderous crimes of heresie imputed unto us, and withall purge themselves of that Antichristian apostasie whereof they are most justly accused and convicted, not onely in *foro poli*, but in their owne consciences, and by the consenting judgement of the Catholike Church for six hundred, nay in some points for fiftene hundred yeares after Christ, they should and would by such a Councell bee deposed from all those Episcopall dignities and functions which they have so long time usurped and abused unto all tyranny, injustice, and subversion of the Catholike Faith.

36. As the proceedings in that Councell were all unlawfull on the Popes part, so were they also both unlawfull and servile in respect of the other Bishops, who were assessors in that Assembly. Could there possibly be any freedome or safety for Protestants among them, being the children of that generation which had most perfidiously violated their faith and promise to *Iohn Hus* in the Councell of *Constance*, and murdered the Prophets? Among whom that Canon authorizing treacherous and perfidious dealing, stood in force: *Quod non obstantibus, that notwithstanding the safe conducts of Emperours, Kings, or any other granted to such as come to their Councils, Quocunque vinculo se astrinxerint, by what bond soever they have tyed themselves, by promise, by their honour, by their oath, yet non obstante any such band they may bring them into inquisition, and proceed to censure, to punish them as they shall thinke fit, and then vaunt and glory in their perfidiousnesse, saying, Caesar obsignavit & Christianus orbis major Casare resignavit; The Emperour hath sealed this with his promise and oath, but our Coun-*

f Conf. Conf.  
fcl. 19.

g Campian.  
Rel. 4.

cell



cell which is above the Emperour, hath repealed it; it shall not stand in force.

37. Could there be any freedome or liberty among those who were by many obligations most servilely addicted to the Pope? The Apulian Bishops<sup>h</sup> crying out, *aliorum omnium nomine, in the name of all the rest in their Council, Nihil aliud sumus praterquam creatura & mancipia sanctissimi patris: O, we are all but the Popes creatures, his very slaves.* The complaint<sup>i</sup> of the Bishop of Arles might here be renewed, which he made of such like Councils, at *Basil*, that must bee done; and of necessity be done and decreed in Councils, *quod nationi placeat Italicæ, which the Italian nation shall affect*; which country alone<sup>k</sup> for multitude of Bishops doth equall or exceed other nations: and this very Italian faction to have prevailed at *Trent*, their owne Bishop *Espencius*, who was at the Council, doth testifie: *Hæc illa Helena est, this is the Helena* which of late prevailed at *Trent*; this Italian faction overswayed all: whereof *Molinus*<sup>m</sup> gives a plaine instance. For when an wholesome Canon, that the Pope might not dispence in some matters, had like to have beene decreed, many in the Council liking well thereof, the Pope procured a respite<sup>n</sup> for that businesse for a month and an halfe, during which time some forty poore Bishops of *Italy* and *Sicily* were shipped and sent to *Trent*, like so many *levis armatura milites*, and so the good Canon was by their valour discomfited and rejected by that holy Synod. Some of the Council also were the Popes pensioners, and stipendary Bishops, nay rather ought than Bishops: such as among others were *Olaus Magnus*<sup>o</sup>, the titular Archbishop of *Vpsala* in *Gothia*, and *Robertus Venantius* the titular<sup>p</sup> and blinde Bishop of *Armach*, and yet not halfe so blinde in body as in minde; Archbishops<sup>q</sup> without Archbishoprickes, without a Church, without a Clergy, without Diocesse, without any revenues, save a small<sup>\*</sup> pension which the Pope allowed them, that they might be cyphers in the Council, and taking his pay might doe him some service for it, and grace his Synod with their subscriptions. But all the other bonds are as nothing to that oath wherewith every one of them was tyed and fettered to the Pope, swearing to uphold the Papall authority against all men, and to fight against all that should rebell against him: an oath so execrable, that *Aneas Sylvius* is<sup>r</sup> mentioned to have said, *Quod etiam verum dicere contra Papam sit contra Episcoporum juramentum, that even to speake the truth, to speake for the truth, if it be contrary to the Pope, is against the oath of Bishops.* By this they were so tyed, at<sup>u</sup> *ne mutire quidem ipsis liceat adversus Idolum Romanum, that they might not so much as whisper against him.*

38. Verily none of those Iron chaines which were used by *Dioscorus* in the *Ephesine* Latrocinie are comparable to these: No subscription unto blankes like the swearing to maintaine whatsoever their *Romane Dioscorus* shall define. They who were not chained might have no place in the Synod; they who were chained with such bands, and specially with such an oath, could have no freedome in the Synod; they must speake, thinke, and teach nothing but what the Pope breathes into them. Had there beene such wise and worthy Iudges

h Carol. Molin.  
lib. de Concil.  
Tridens.  
nu. 21.  
i cl. Espenc. com.  
in Epist. ad Tit.  
ca. 1. p. 42.  
k Vt quæ sola  
Episcoporum numero  
nationes alias æquet aut  
superet. ibid.  
l Jbid.  
m Car. Mol. locd  
citato.  
n Pont. sex ad  
sequimensem  
decreti conclusi-  
onem ampliari  
jussit. ibid.  
o Olaus Magnus  
Suevus qui Ar-  
chiepiscopi Vp-  
salensis nomen et  
titulum vendi-  
cabat, quæ qui-  
dem regio nec  
Pontificem un-  
quam, nec Ecce-  
siam Romanam  
agnovit. Gent.  
Exam. Conc.  
Trid. sess. 1. nu. 3  
p Jbid.  
q Archiepiscopi,  
sive Archiepisc-  
opatu, sive Ec-  
clesia, sive Clero,  
sive ullo censu  
reditu. ibid.  
\* Hos Archie-  
piscopos rerum  
tenuis & inopes  
Romæ suis stipen-  
diis aluerat Pon-  
tife. x. ibid. Olaus  
in singulis men-  
ses 15. aureos  
nummos suppe-  
ditabat. ibid.  
r Extr. ad Inve-  
jur. ca. Ego N.  
s In nova jura-  
menti forma in-  
super hoc jurant  
Episcopi, se here-  
ticos, omnesq; re-  
belles Pontifici  
extremè infesta-  
turos, & perse-  
quuturos. Grav.  
oppos. Conc. Tri-  
dent. p. 2. caus. 4  
p. 52.  
t Ibidem in Pa-  
ral. ad Abbat.  
Vt per p. 418.  
u Ibid. p. 51.

for

a Conc. Chal.  
act. 8. & 10.

for Presidents of that Council, as there was at *Chalcedon*, could they possibly have endured to see all synodall freedome thus oppressed and banished? Nay they would in their zeale to God and his truth, have broken and burst in sunder every linke of that chaine: And as *ibid* and *Theodoret* were not admitted to the Council of *Chalcedon* as members thereof, till they had openly renounced and anathematized the heresies which they had before embraced: So would not those glorious Iudges have permitted any of those *Tridentine* Bishops to have sit in the Council, till they had openly renounced, anathematized, and abjured that oath, and with it their vassallage to the Pope, and all those hereticall doctrines which by their adhering to the Pope, and following his faction, they had embraced: and those are Image-worship, Transubstantiation, proper Sacrifice, Adoration of the Host, their Purgatorian fire, and the rest of those heresies, which, since the Romane faction began to prevaile, (and that was about seven hundred yeares after Christ, in the dayes of *Gregory* the second, who as I suppose, first of all by synodall judgement decreed the worship of Images,) they have maintained: For seeing since that time not truth nor equity, but faction prevailed in their Synods, and swayed matters in their Church, there could be no equall triall of the truth by any of their Synods held since that time. But when all the Bishops were freed from those chaines of their oath and slavish bondage to the Pope, since the faction (whereof he hath beene the leader) got the upper hand, those glorious Iudges would have permitted nothing to passe for a free synodall sentence, but that onely which could have had warrant from the Scriptures, those holy Councils and consenting judgement of those Fathers who lived within the six hundred yeares or somewhat more after Christ, at what time partiality and faction had not corrupted and blinded their judgement, as in the second *Nicene*, and ever since it hath.

y Gen. Exam.  
Conc. Trid. sess.  
15. nu. 3.

z Obsecrant in  
disputationis a-  
renam descendere,  
& se certamine  
offerebant. *ibid*.  
a *ibidem*.

b Neque admitti  
fuerint ad sue  
fidei professionem  
proponendam &  
discutiendam, et  
haud unquam  
admitti potue-  
runt ut suam fi-  
dei confessionem  
in synodi publico  
conventu exhibe-  
rent, ac multo  
minus dogma-  
ta que in ea con-  
tinebantur di-  
scutiendi asse-  
rent. *ibid* Gen.  
in Exam. lib. 5.  
nu. 4. pa. 317.  
c *Ibid* pa. 320.  
d Melc. Can. lib.  
12. loc. Theol. ca.  
23. S. Extat.  
e Cyp. Valer.  
in Marc. 2.  
f *ibid*.

39. But because such glorious Iudges and their most equall Presidency was wanting, nay was banished from their Assembly at *Trent*, scarce any tokens or shadow of freedome could take place therein. Not towards Protestants. *Brentius* y, and divers other learned Divines came to *Trent*, offered z themselves and their faith to triall of disputations, *Nulla ratione a impetrari potuit, this could not be obtained by any meanes*, that they should come to dispute b for the faith. c *Nullus unquam liber aditus Protestantibus, the Protestants at no time had any freedom to come to the Council at Trent*. Not towards their owne Bishops, if they spake or did ought tending to the defence of the truth. *Cornelius* Bishop of *Bitons* said d, that Christ offered not in his last supper his owne body and blood: this crossed their proper sacrifice of the masse, therefore *Cornelius* for that free & true speech, a *Patribus universis explosus est, was hissed out of their Trent Council by all the Fathers and Divines there present*. *Iacobus Nachiantes* e Bishop of *Clodia Fossa*, sayd, he could not approve that traditions should be held in equal reverence as the Scripture, he was for this truth expulsed the Council. *Gulielmus* f *Venetus* a Dominican Fryer, sayd in the Council, that the Council was above the Pope, he was commanded to depart out of the Council.

cell. Another of the Bishops hapning to touch, and that but lightly, the pride of the Pope in his titles, wished, that seeing God is no where in the Scripture called *sanctissimus*, but *sanctus*, the Pope also would be content with the same title of *sanctus*, and not take a more ample name of honour than is given in Scripture unto God. The Pope being certified hereof, sent for him to come from *Trent* to *Rome*, and gave him to his Officers to use him hardly<sup>h</sup>, and to bee degraded. *Petrus Vigerius* Bishop of *Iustinianople*, (he who endeavoring to refuse the Protestant writings, and began that booke which hee intituled, *Against the Apostates of Germany*, was himselfe overcome by the evidence of that truth, specially in the doctrine of Iustification, which he oppugned) came to the Countell at *Trent*: The Pope having intelligence that he was inclined to *Lutheranisme*, writ to his Legats at *Trent*, *Ne locum ei tribuant in confesso, That they should not admit him into their Countell*, but command him to depart. *Ad hunc modum eliminatus*, by this meanes was the Bishop excluded from their free Synod: and if *Iohannis Casus* the Popes Legate to the Venetians, and Archbishop of *Beneventum*, (who writ a<sup>m</sup> booke in the praise of one of the most detestable and damnable finnes) could have prevailed to have entised<sup>n</sup> him to goe to *Rome*, he had not thence escaped so easily as he did from *Trent*. Could any of these or the like enormous disorders, which utterly subvert all synodall freedome, have beene endured, had there beene equall and prudent Presidents for Kings and Emperours in that Countell? But the Imperiall presidency being abandoned, together with it, was all freedome and synodall orders excluded. So that I may truly say both of these *Tridentine*, and their other nine Synods, that as by reason of their want of this Imperiall presidency, they had many disorders, so by reason they excluded that Presidency, they had, nay they could have nothing in them at all but disorder.

40. You see now the severall kinds of unlawfull Councils, as well by want of Imperiall calling, or of Imperiall Presidency, as when neither is wanting, by the abuse of that Imperiall authority in the Synod. And though the unlawfulnessse of those ten later Synods doth now appeare to be farre greater than of those ancient Councils before mentioned; seeing in all the ancient there was not onely a lawfull calling, but a lawfull presidency also, both which were wanting in the other tenne, besides the unlawfull proceedings which were equally in both, or rather farre worse in the later: yet is there one especiall difference that is principally to be remembred, which issuing from the former diversity of unlawfulnessse, makes a greater oddes than at the first one would imagine: and this it is: When the unlawfulnessse of any Synod ariseth (as in their tenne Synods it doth) from the want of the first condition, that is, of lawfull calling and authority to assemble and judge, be the consultations and proceedings of such Synods otherwise never so orderly, and their resolutions never so just and true, yet for making of any Canon or Decree, or giving any synodall judgement, there is an invalidity in all such Synods, and a meer nullity in all their Decrees, Canons, and Iudgements. They had no authority to assemble in a Synod, much lesse<sup>e</sup> have they any authority to make a Law,

g Car. Molin. li. de Conc. Trid. nu. 22.

h Satal. tibius suis de gradu deprecandum & daver traclandum propinavit. Ibid. i Iob. Sleid. Com. lib. 21. pa. 304.

k Seq. Dum confutadi causa librorum adversariorum diligenter excutit, & attente argumenta confidat, captum se victumq. sensit. Ibid.

l Ibid. & plura de eo lege apud Cypr. Valer. in Marcel. 2.

m Nec puduit eum scelus omnium longe turpissimum celebrare laudibus. Iob.

Sleid. loc. citat.

n Eum, uti Romanam peteret modis omnibus hortatur Casus;

Vigerius vero qui periculum suum intelligeret, recusat. Ibid.

o Si legitima finis non fuit, planum est nullam auctoritatem potuisse habere: & nullius votum sunt illius canonones. Bell. lib. 2 de Pont. ca. 18. S. Caterum: & S. Ac deinde, & Sententia non suo Iudice diffinitur, nihil firmius obtinet. Greg. lib. 11. Epist. 36.



or give judgement in that Synod. That which is invalid in the spring and originall, must needs in all the subsequent actions derived from thence, & depending thereon, retain the same invalidity. And seeing it is neither multitude, nor learning, nor wisdom, but authority which is the fountain and foundation of all Lawes, Canons, and Iudgements, where this authority is wanting in any person or assembly, it is as impossible for such a person or assembly to make a law, give any judgement, or pronounce any iudiciall sentence, as to erect an house in the ayre, or build without any foundation. And truly this toucheth all the quick all those ten Councils, which wanting authority to assemble them, were no other but tumultuous, seditious, and unauthorized assemblies. There was no more strength, validity, or vigour in any of their Decrees to binde as lawes, or synodall judgements, than there was in such Edicts as *Spartacus* and *Catiline* in *Rome*, or *Iacke Cade* in this Kingdome should have published and set forth: specially in that which he like another Pope intended to be his fundamentall law, That all lawes should proceed out of his mouth. Those which they untuly call the Canons, Decrees, or Iudgements of those Synods, are onely the opinions, resolutions, and consultations of so many seditious men which covenanted and conspired together in those conjurations: synodall Decrees, or Ecclesiasticall Lawes and Iudgements they were not, they could not be. In the head, they are nipt and tainted with a nullity of authority, they beare this tainture and nullity throughout every part and parcell of their determinations.

41. But when the unlawfulnessse of any Synod ariseth (as in the ancient Councils at *Arimine*, *Millane*, and *Ephesus* it did) from the want of the other condition, that is, of orderly proceedings onely, the Bishops being both lawfully called, and having a lawfull President, the case is here farre different; their acts and sentences though they be unlawfull, yet are they truly iudiciall, and have the authority of synodall judgements, and therefore doe binde others, though not in conscience to accept them as true, yet with patience to submit themselves to their censures, till by like authority they be revoked, and repealed. Even as in civill Courts, though an unjust or partiall Iudge, either for feare, favour, hatred, desire of lucre, or any other perturbation of minde, shall wilfully pervert justice and due proceedings, and pronounce an unjust sentence: yet is this act iudiciall, and stands in force of a judgement, till by the like, or higher authority it be reversed, because such an one had authority and rightfull power to judge and give sentence in that cause, though he abused his authority to injustice and wrong: Right so it is in synodall and Ecclesiasticall assemblies, when they are lawfully called and authorized to heare and judge any matter, their want of due, orderly, and just proceedings makes their judgement unjust, and shewes them to be wicked and malicious conspirators against the truth, but it doth not make the decree to be no judgement, or no iudiciall sentence of a Council. The corruption is now in the branch, not in the root: the abuse of their authority makes not a nullity in their act: It hinders not them to bee truly and rightfully Iudges, but it demonstrates them not to bee upright, good, and just Iudges,

Judges, it shewes their sentence to be wicked and impious, but it hinders it not to be a judiciall sentence. Whereof that one (among many) in the *Ephesine* Latrociny, is a cleare example. In it *Eusebius* Bishop of *Dorileum* was most wickedly and unjustly depofed from his See, yet this their unjust sentence stood in force, till by the like authority of another generall Council at *Chalcedon*, it was repealed: for in it *Eusebius* sate not at the first as a Iudge, but as an accuser of *Dioscorus*, and in the place of accusers: He entreated the holy Council that all the Acts and Iudgements at *Ephesus*, *wiribus carere*, might be adnulled and declared to be of no force, and that hee might enjoy as before that sentence he did, *Sacerdotali dignitate, his Episcopall dignity and See*. The holy Synod consented to his just request, received him as a member of the Council, restored him to his See, and adnulled all the acts of the *Ephesine* Latrociny, requesting the Emperour to ratifie and confirme that their Iudgement.

42. Such an exceeding great and most remarkable difference there is betwixt those ancient and these ten later unlawfull Synods. Though both be unlawfull; yet in the former there was a binding force for a while, till they were repealed; but in these later there never was any power to binde any, either to accept their Decrees, or to undergoe their censures, because *ab initio* there was a meere nullity in all their Acts. Againe, the inflicting of any punishment upon the judgement of the former, had the warrant, though not of divine, yet of humane authority, and was to bee presumed as just; (the sentence of every Iudge, even *eo nomine*, because he is a Iudge, being to bee presumed just, untill upon evident prooffe it bee declared to bee unjust.) But what censures or punishments soever are, or at any time have beene denounced or inflicted on any, upon the warrant or Iudgement of these last ten Synods, they are all *ab initio* meere tyranous, and unjust, inflicted without any either divine or humane authority, (seeing those Synods had none at all) there is not so much as a presumption that they were or could be just, but for their want of authority in decreeing them, they are (though otherwise equall) presumed to be unjust.

43. And thus much I have thought good to insert concerning all sorts of Councils, as well lawfull as unlawfull: to manifest hereby not onely the injurious dealing of *Baronius* with this fift Council, against which he declameth as an impious and unlawfull conspiracy; but their vanity also in extolling and magnifying many, and specially those last ten, for holy, lawfull, and oecumenicall Synods; of which dignity they are so farre short, that they are all most deservedly to be ranked with the *Ephesine* Latrocinie, and put in the *Classis* of those which of all other are the most base, impious, unlawfull, and disorderly Councils.

p Flavianum et  
Eusebium ab  
omni Episcopali  
dignitate judi-  
camus esse alie-  
nos. Conc. Ephes.  
in act. Conc. Chal-  
ced. act. 1. p. 57. b.  
q Et Eusebius ex  
Theodoretus in  
ordine accusan-  
tium sedenti, Con-  
chalced. act. 1. p. 13. a.  
r Conc. Chalced.  
act. 3. p. 66.  
[ Nam act. 6. p. 101. b. Eusebius  
Dorilei subscri-  
bit definitioni fi-  
dei inter alios.  
r Presens omne  
Concilium de-  
precatur Impera-  
torem quatenus  
piam legem sanc-  
iat, neq. Syno-  
dum illam (E-  
phesinam 2.)  
nominari, neque  
quidquam quod  
actum est in ea  
teneri. Conc.  
Chalced. act. 10. p. 115. §. Anato-  
lius. Et p. 116.  
Omnes eodem  
dicimus.

## CAP. XX.

*How Cardinall Baronius revileth the Emperour Iustinian, and a refutation of the same.*

<sup>a</sup> Cap. 5. nu. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Vides quanta  
jactura—

cum Principes  
indicare audent  
ipsi sacerdotibus  
leges, à quibus  
sanctitas serva-  
re ipsi debent.  
Bar. an. 553.  
nu. 237.

<sup>c</sup> Si quis ejusmo-  
di esset, leges  
sanctaret de fide,  
an. 546. nu. 43.  
<sup>d</sup> Fuit homo pe-  
nitus illiteratus,  
adeo ut nec Al-  
phabetum ali-  
quando didicif-  
set, an. 528. nu. 2.  
<sup>e</sup> Illiteratus  
Theologus, an.  
551. nu. 2.

<sup>f</sup> Cum esset peni-  
tus illiteratus,  
an. 546. nu. 41.  
<sup>g</sup> Iustiniani lege-  
re nescientis, an.  
538. nu. 32.  
<sup>h</sup> Qui nunquam  
degere sciverit  
vel ipsum scri-  
ptum titu-  
lum Bibborum,  
an. 551. nu. 4.

<sup>i</sup> Ut qui nec pri-  
ma elementa  
calleret, ut leg-  
re posset, an. 546  
nu. 43.

<sup>k</sup> Fecit analpha-  
betum Imperato-  
rem repente pal-  
liatum apparere  
Theologum, an.  
551. nu. 4.

<sup>l</sup> Cui us sibi sub-  
dita aggressus e-  
rat prescribere  
leges, an. 551.  
nu. 2.

<sup>m</sup> Sacrarū legū  
cōditorem agit: desacerdotibus leges ferre,  
in eosque penas statuere, prater jus fasq;  
presument, an. 528. nu. 2. <sup>n</sup> Ab Imper-  
atoris sacrilegi violentia, an. 552. nu. 8. <sup>o</sup> Just. à persecutione cessavit, an. 553. nu. 14. <sup>p</sup> Et quod monstrosum accessit,  
ab Imperatore persecutio excitata fuit, et haud quidem levis, an. 553. nu. 221. <sup>q</sup> Ab Imperatoris furoris, an. 552. nu. 8. ille  
furoris percussus, mente dimotus, correptus maligno spiritu, agitaturs à Satana, an. 551. nu. 2. <sup>r</sup> à quo accepturi essent leges Epi-  
scopi, an. 551. nu. 4.



I. **V**E have hitherto seene and fully examined all the material exceptions which *Baronius* could devise to excuse Pope *Vigilius* from heresie: and in them consists the whole pith, and all the sinewes of the cause; they being the onely arguments which are to be reckoned as the lawfull warriors of the Cardinall. Now followeth that other Troupe, whereof I told you <sup>a</sup> before, of his piraticall and disorderly Straglers, which the Cardinall hath mustred together, not that they should dispute or reason in this cause, but to raile and revile at every thing whereat their Leader is displeased: And the Cardinall doth this with so impotent affections, in so immodest, that I say not so scurrill a manner, and with such virulency of all uncivill and most undutiful speeches, that you shall see him now, having cast away all that gravity and modesty which is fit not onely for a Divine, a Cardinall, a Disputer, but for a man of any temper, or sobriety, to act herein no other part but *Hercules Furens*, or *Ajax mastigophorus*, without all respect either of authority, or dignity, or innocency, lashing every body, and every thing that comes in his way, be it friend or foe; sparing nothing that seemes to crosse his fancy, not the Emperour *Iustinian*, not the Empresse *Theodora*, not *Theodorus* Bishop of Cesarea, not the Imperiall Edict, not the controversie and cause it selfe of the *Three Chapters*, not the Acts of the holy Generall Councell, not Pope *Vigilius* himselfe; nothing can scape the whippe of his tongue and pen. Let us begin with the Emperour, against whom *Baronius* declameth in this manner.

2. Princes <sup>b</sup> to dare to make lawes for Priests? who should obey the lawes made by them. Such <sup>c</sup> an one as Iustinian make lawes of faith? an <sup>d</sup> abcedary Emperour: an illiterate <sup>e</sup> Theologue: utterly <sup>f</sup> unlearned: who <sup>g</sup> knew not how to reade: who <sup>h</sup> could never reade the title of the Bible: no not the very first elements: not his Alpha, Beta: He on a sodaine to become a <sup>k</sup> palliated Divine? Hee to prescribe lawes <sup>l</sup> for the Church, as subject to his? Hee against <sup>m</sup> all right and equity to presume to make lawes of sacred matters of Priests? He to set downe punishments for them? Hee who was not onely thus utterly unlearned, but withall an enemy to the Church, a <sup>n</sup> sacrilegious person: a <sup>o</sup> persecutor: a grievous, a <sup>p</sup> monstrous persecutor: one who was madde <sup>q</sup>, franticke, and out of his wits, who was possessed with an evil spirit, and driven by the Devill himselfe? Such an one <sup>r</sup> make lawes for Bishops?



what is this else, but to confound<sup>r</sup> all things, to treade<sup>r</sup> under foote the sacred Canons, to abolish utterly the Church discipline, to<sup>u</sup> dissolve all divine order, and to make of the Kingdome of heaven (which the Church is) the very prison of hell, where there is nothing but confusion? Thus the Cardinall: And this is but the first pageant of his *Ajax*, and but some gleanings neither of that harvest, which is abundant in his Annals.

3. Not to seeke any exact, or methodicall refutation hereof: All that the Cardinall hath hitherto said may bee reduced to three notorious slanders, by which he laboureth to blemish the immortall fame and unspotted honour of that most religious Emperour. The first concernes *His knowledge and learning*; Iustinian not able to reade? not know so much as his *Alphabet*? Is there any in the world, thinke you, so very stupid, as to beleve the Cardinall in this so shamelesse, so incredible an untruth? *Tanti ingenii, tantaque doctrina fuisse constat*, saith *Platina*<sup>x</sup>; it is manifest, that Iustinian was of so great a wit, and so great learning, that it is not to bee marveiled if hee reduced the lawes, being confused before, into order: *Tritemius*<sup>y</sup> saith of him, *He was a man of an excellent wit, and hee is deservedly<sup>z</sup> reckoned among Ecclesiasticall Writers*; and hee expressely mentioneth three bookes which hee writ against *Eutyches*, one against the *Africane Bishops*: adding, that none may doubt, but that besides these, hee writ many and very excellent Epist. *Posservine*<sup>a</sup> the Iesuite acknowledgeth him, with *Tritemius*, for an *Ecclesiasticall Writer*; & besides the reciting of those same bookes which *Tritemius* mentioned, hee alleageth these words of their Pontificall, most worthy to be observed for this purpose: *Iustinian the Emperour a religious man, sent unto the Apostolike See his profession of faith, Scriptam chirographo proprio, written with his own hand, testifying his great love to the Christiā Religion*. In regard of w<sup>ch</sup> his excellēt writings, both Pope *Agatho*<sup>\*</sup>, and the whole sixt generall Councell with him, who lived in the next age to Iustinian, reckoneth him in the same ranke; not onely of Ecclesiasticall Writers; but of venerable Fathers, with Saint *Cyrril*, Saint *Chrysostome* and others, whose writings doe give testimony to the truth. *Liberatus* who lived in the dayes of Iustinian; and who was no well-willer of the Emperour; yet could not but record, That he<sup>b</sup> writ a Booke against the *Acephali* or *Eutichean heretikes*; in defence of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and that *Theodorus* seeing him so tyled in writing against heretikes, told him, *Scribendi laborem non cum debere pati*; That he should not trouble himselfe with writing bookes, but maintaine the faith by publishing Edicts. *Procopius*<sup>c</sup>, who was familiarly conversant with Iustinian, recites that traiterous perswasion of *Aspases* to *Artabanus*, when he excited him to murder the Emperour; This (saith hee) you may doe easily, and without danger, for the Emperour is not mistrustfull, and he passeth the time till very late of the night in talking without any watch or guard, having none but some old and feeble Bishops about him, *Christianorum scriptis miro studio revolvendis intentus*, being marvellously addicted to reade and peruse the writings of Christians. Are these, thinke you, the actions of an illiterate, of an Abcedary Emperour? And what speake I of these? The *Pandects*, the *Code*, the *Authentikes*, the *Institutions*, the whole body of the law proclame

Confundi annia necesse est. an. 553. nu. 237. Canonis ipse conculcat, censuramq; pessundat Ecclesiasticam economiam; an. 541. nu. 16. u Sicq; ommem in Ecclesia dissolveret ordinem, faceretque ex regno calorum ergastulum inferorum, an. 551. nu. 4.

x In vita Bonifac. 2.

y Lib. de script.

Eccles.

z Locum inter

Ecclesiasticos

scriptores merito

acquisivit. Ibid.

a Appar. Sac.

in verbo Iustinianus.

anus.

\* Conc. 6. Aet. 4. in Epist. Agath.

b In Brevia. cd. 24.

c Lib. 3. de bell. Goth.

the incredible wisedome, and rare knowledge of Iustinian, All people  
 faith he,<sup>d</sup> are governed by the lawes, *Tam à nobis promulgatis quam compo-*  
<sup>p</sup> *Infir. Proem.* *tis*, as well published as composed by us: and though he used the lear-  
 ning, helpe, and industry of other worthy men, (whose names he hath  
 commended to all posterity, and never-dying fame) yet when they  
 offered the bookes unto him, *Et legimus & recognovimus*, faith he,<sup>\*</sup> wee  
 both read them and examined them; which the glosse explaineth,  
 saying, *Nos ipsi legimus*, We our selves have reade and perused them.  
 So that I cannot sufficiently admire this most shamelesse untruth of  
*Baronius*, in reviling him for an illiterate, and not so much as an Ab-  
 cedarie scholler, whose wit, learning, and prudence hath beene, and  
 will for ever bee a mirrour to all ages.

<sup>c</sup> *Bar. an. 518.*

<sup>nu. 2.</sup>

<sup>f</sup> *In verbo Iust.*

<sup>g</sup> *In appar. ver-*  
*bo Suidas.*

<sup>h</sup> *Suid. in verbo*  
*Constantinus.*

<sup>i</sup> *Poss. in verbo*  
*Suidas.*

4. But *Suidas* (faith the Cardinall<sup>e</sup>) doth affirme<sup>f</sup> the same, calling  
*Iustinian* *ἀνὰ πάλαιον*, and void of all learning: For answer whereunto,  
 first, I would gladly know of the Cardinall, how hee can assure us  
 that this is indeed the saying of *Suidas*? specially seeing their owne  
 Iesuite *Possesine* tels us for a certainty, that *Plarague*, very many things  
 are falsly inserted into *Suidas*; and that, *à Sciolis & Schismaticis*, by some  
 smatterers or Schismaticks; and further, that those *Plarague*, are such  
 as are repugnant to the Euangelicall truth, and Historicall sinceritie. How  
 may wee be assured, that this concerning *Iustinian*, is not one of those  
*Plarague*, seeing this to be contrary to Historicall sincerity, doth by  
 those many and evident proofes which wee before produced, fully ap-  
 peare? Againe, admitting *Suidas* for the Author thereof: is *Suidas*  
 thinke you of more; or equall authority and credit to their Pontifi-  
 call? which witnesseth expressly, that *Iustinian* writ the holy confes-  
 sion of his faith, *Chirographo proprio*, with his owne hand? Equall to  
*Tritemius* and *Possesine*, or (to winke at them) to Pope *Agatho* and  
 the sixt generall Conncell? who all account *Iustinian* among the Wri-  
 ters of the Church. Who I pray you was this *Suidas*? truly an ear-  
 nest defender of those impieties, which in their second Nicene Sy-  
 nod began to prevaile; who in reviling manner doth call<sup>h</sup> *Constantin*  
*Iconomachus*, a Serpent, an Antichrist, and the disciple of the Devill: and  
 all, for his not consenting to the adoration of Images, and reliques, and to  
 the Invocation of Saints. Now how this sort of men were given to lyes  
 and fables, the Acts of that Synod doe fully demonstrate: Or if you  
 rather desire to have their Iesuites judgement of *Suidas*, hee will tell  
 you first, that he was hereticall, in teaching<sup>i</sup> the Essence in the Godhead to  
 be generative, which their Laterane Councell hath condemned for an heresy.  
 Hee will tell you further, that this booke is full of errors, fables, and  
 lyes, of which sort are these, among many. That the world was made of  
 the Poëticall Chaos; that it shal continue 1200. thousand yeares: that the Sun  
 and Starres, are fierie Substances, fed and perpetuated by terrestriall humours  
 as their nutriment: that Paradise is *Hortus pensilis*, a garden hanging in  
 the ayre farre above the earth: that Caine was begotten of the Devill, which  
 is a lye; that the Jewes adored an asses head, and every seventh yeare sacri-  
 ficed a stranger: His narration (in verbo Nero) touching *Annas* and *Ca-*  
*phas*, *Pilate*, *Peter*, and *Simon Magnus*, wherein multi a comminiscitur, he for-  
 geth many things: His narration (in verbo *Iulianus*) which hee calleth in  
 expresse words, *mendacium flagiciosissimum*, a most lewd lie: His slan-

dering

dering Constantine the great, as base of birth; and his sonne Crispus as incestuous: His commending of *Acatius* and *Acetius* two heretikes: adding, that he writeth many things, *contra Historiam ueritatem*, against the Historiall truth. His relation (*in uerbo Apollonius*) where many things are praised, *qua omnia monstrata sunt*; & *prorsus explodenda*, all which are utterly to be hissed at: where also he seemeth to allow the impious Art of Magicke, and Divinations: His approving of *Appolonius* and *Danis*, two wicked Magitians, who both are *relegati ad inferos*, condemned to Hell. And to omit very many of this kinde of impieties and fables, which abound in *Suidas*: His narration (*in uerbo Iesus*) which not onely *Baronius* rejecteth, but Pope Paul the fourth, for that cause beside some other <sup>k</sup> exploded the booke of *Suidas*, and placed it in the ranke *librorum prohibitorum*: Such, even by the confession of their owne Iesuite, is this *Suidas*: a depraver of good, a commender of wicked men, a fabler, a lyer, a falsifier of Histories, a Magitian, an Heretike, whose booke is by the Pope forbidden to bee read. Such a worthy witnesse hath the Cardinall of his *Suidas*, with whom he conspireth in reviling *Iustinian*, as one utterly unlearned. Concerning which untruth, I will say no more at this time than that which *Gotofrid* doth in his censure <sup>l</sup> of those words of *Suidas*, where calling it in plaine termes a slander, he rejects it, as it justly deserveth; in this manner, *Valeant calumnia, nos sinceriora sequamur*; Away with this and such like opprobrious slanders of *Suidas* and *Baronius*; but let us follow the truth:

<sup>k</sup> Exploditur in  
Iudicem lib.  
prohib.

<sup>l</sup> Auct. lib. Iustit.

5. His second reproofe of the Emperour is, for presuming to make *Laves* in causes of faith; which for Kings and Emperours to doe, brings (as he faith) an hellish confusion into the Church of God: The wit of a Cardinal! *Iustinian* may not doe that which King *Hezekiah*, which *Asa*, which *Iosiah*, and *Constantine* the great, the two *Theodosii*, *Martian*, and other holy Emperours before had done, and done it by the warrant of God, to the eternall good of the Church, and their owne immortall fame: Had hee indeed, or any of those Emperours taken upon them by their lawes to establish some new, erroneous, or hereticall doctrine, the Cardinall might in this case have justly reprovved them; but this they did not: what doctrines the Prophets delivered, the word of God taught; and holy Synods had before decreed and explained; those, and none else did *Iustinian*, by his Edict, and other religious Emperours, ratifie by their imperiall authority: Heare *Iustinians* owne words, *Wee have thought it needfull by this our Edict to manifest that right confession of faith, qua in sancta Dei Ecclesia predicatur*, which is preached in the holy Church of God. Here is no new faith; no Edict for any new doctrine, but for maintaining that onely faith which the holy Catholike Church taught, and the Councell of *Chalcedon* had decreed; wherein that *Iustinian* did nothing but worthy of eternal praise, the whole fift Councell, and the whole Catholike Church approving it, is a witnesse about exception, which entreating of that which *Iustinian* had done in this cause of the *Three Chapters*; (the chiefe of all which was the publishing of his most religious Edict, to condemn the same) faith, *Omnia semper fecit & facit, qua sanctam Ecclesiam*; &

<sup>f</sup> Edict. Justin.  
in causa trium  
Capitul. in  
princip.

<sup>g</sup> coll. 7. in fine  
reclat



*recta dogmata conservant*; Iustinian hath ever done, and as yet doth all things which preserve the holy Church, and the true faith. So the Councell. Is not *Baronius* minde composed of venome and malice, who condemnes and reviles the Emperour, as bringing hellish confusion into the Church, by publishing that law, which to have beene an especiall meanes to preserve the Church and Catholike faith, the holy generall Councell, and all the whole Catholike Church with it proclameeth.

6. See here againe the love and respect which *Baronius* beares to the Imperiall lawes, and to those holy and religious Emperours, which were the nursing fathers of Gods Church, and pillars to uphold the faith in their dayes. There are extant in the Theodosian Code many laws concerning the Catholike faith; concerning *Bish. Churches*, and the *Clergy*; concerning *Heretikes*, *Apostates*, *Monkes*, *Iewes*, and *Samaritanes*; concerning *Pagan sacrifices*, and *Temples*; concerning *Religion*, *Episcopall judgement*, *those who flee unto Churches*, and many other of the same kinde: lawes wholesome and necessary for those times. The like titles are extant also in the Code of Iustinian. In the Authenticks there are I know not how many lawes in the like causes: Of the *fourc Councells*, of the *Order of Patriarchs*, of the *building of Churches*, of *goods belonging to sacred places*, of the *holy Communion*, of *Litanies*, of the *memorials for the dead*, of the *Priviledges of Churches*, of *Patriarchs*, of the *Pope of old Rome*, of *Archbishops*, of *Abbots*, of *Presbyters*, of *Deacons*, of *Subdeacons*, of *Monkes*, of *Anchorites*, of *Synods*, of *deposing Bishops who fall into heresie*, that *Patrons who builded Churches*, and *their heyers shall nominate the Clerks for the same*; and in case they name such as are unmeet, then the *Bishop to appoint who he thinks fit*, that *Heretikes shall be incapable of any legacies*: and exceeding many the like. Now such a spite hath the Cardinall to the Emperours, and these their Imperiall lawes, made concerning the affaires of the Church, that like some new *Aristarchus*, with one dash of his pen, hee takes upon him to casheire, and utterly abolish those lawes, (five or sixe hundreth at the least, with such care, piety, and prudence, set forth by *Constantine*, *Theodosius*, *Valentinian*, *Gratian*, *Martian*, *Iustinian*, and other holy and religious Emperours: And when these are gone, whether the Cardinall meant not after them, to wipe away (which with as good reason, and authority he may) all the other lawes, which are in the Digest, Code, and Authenticks, that so his master the Pope may play even another Iack Cade, that all law might proceed out of his mouth, let the judicious consider. This is cleare, that the Cardinals malice is not satisfied with reproofe of the lawes themselves: even these holy Emperours *Constantine*, *Theodosius* and the rest, are, together with *Iustinian*, for the making of those lawes touching Ecclesiasticall affaires and persons, reproved, nay reviled by *Baronius*, as having beene presumptuous persons, authors of an hellish confusion in the Church, and for turning heaven into hell. They, and such as they, make lawes of faith? lawes for Bishops? lawes for the Church? let them heare, as they well deserve, and as the \* Cardinall shameth not to upbraid to *Iustinian*, *Ne ultra crepidam*, Sir Cobler goe not beyond you Last and Latchet: So indignly doth the Cardinall use those holy and religious

gious Princes, and that even for their zeale to Gods truth and love to his Church, for that which with exceeding piety and prudence they performed to their owne immortall honor, and to the peace and tranquillity of the whole Church of God.

7. His third calumnie is, that hee revileth *Iustinian* for his sacrilegious fury and persecution which hee used against *Pope Vigilius*, partly when *Vigilius* was buffeted and beaten at Constantinople, before the time of the Councell, and forced to flee to Chalcedon; partly when he was banished after the end of the Councell, for not consenting with the Synod in condemning the Three Chapters. Alas, how hath heresie and malice quite blinded the Cardinall, and bereft him of his understanding? *Iustinian* neither before the Councell, nor after it, persecuted *Vigilius*. *Vigilius* was neither beaten, nor buffeted, nor fled hee either to Saint Peter, or to Saint Euphemia, nor was he banished at all; these all are nothing but the Poeticall and Chimericall fictions of the Cardinall, no truth, no realty at all in them, as we have before fully demonstrated. Iudge now I pray you, whether any but some *Ajax furiosus*, or who were deprived of his wits, would call the Emperour madde, franticke, sacrilegious, possessed and guided by the Devill, for persecuting and banishing him, who neither was persecuted nor banished, but enjoyed the latitude of liberty, and all the benefits thereof, even the Emperours favour, and the comforts accompanying it. But admit *Vigilius* had been banished, as indeed many other Bishops were, for defending the Three Chapters against the Decree of the holy generall Councell: was *Iustinian* a persecutor, a monstrous sacrilegious persecutor, for banishing or punishing condemned heretikes, and Nestorians? such as all the defenders of the Three Chapters to have beene wee have before declared. What a monstrous persecutor then was holy *Constantine* for banishing *Theognis* Bishop of Nice, and *Eusebius* Bishop of Nicomedia, for refusing to consent to the Nicene Synod? What a persecutor was *Theodosius* the elder, who commanded all that held the Macedonian heresie to be banished and shut out of their Churches without any hope to recover the same againe? What a persecutor was *Theodosius* the younger, who forbade all men to have or reade the bookes of Nestorius, or to admit the Nestorians into any City, Towne, Village or house? What an horrible and monstrous persecutor was *Martian*, who made a law that if any should teach the Eutichean heresie, ultimo supplicio coercebitur, he shall bee put to death. If *Constantine*, *Theodosius* the elder and younger, and *Martian* bee no persecutors, notwithstanding this severity in exiling, punishing, and putting to death heretikes: what a malicious slanderer is *Baronius* for condemning *Iustinian* as a persecutor, for banishing, imprisoning, or punishing with like severity the defenders of the three Chapters, who were every way as detestable, as damnable, & as truly convicted & condemned heretikes, by the judgment of an holy general Councell, as either the Arians, Macedonians, Euticheans, or old Nestorians? Thus to persecute, that is, justly punish heretikes, is laudable: thus to be persecuted is ignominious. *Non est peccatum malos persequi*, saith Saint *Augustine*. To persecute and justly punish wicked men is no offence; neither are they just who are so persecuted, but he who is persecuted for righteousnes sake.

h Bar. an. 551.  
2. et 552. nu. 8.  
i Bar. an. 553.  
nu. 221. et 222.  
etc.

k Sup. ca. 18.  
et 17.

\* Ca. 4. 5. et seq.

l Socrat. lib. 1.  
c. 10.

m L. 3. de fide  
Cath. Cod. Theod.

n Leg. ult. de  
her. Cod. Theod.

o Exalt in Conc.  
chal. A. 453.  
pa 86.

p Lib. cont. Fulgent. Donat. art. 20.

q Lib. 1. cont.  
later. Petil. ca. 27  
r Aug. lib. 3.  
cont. lit. Petil.  
ca. 14.

Had *Iustinian* done this to *Vigilius*, hee had beene no persecutor: But *Vigilius* who oppugned the truth, & *Baronius* who with such a virulent tongue reviles and railes at the defenders of Gods truth; they, and none but they, are persecutors in this cause: They kill not the Prophets nor Apostles, but they kill & murder, as cruelly as they can, that truth of God which the Prophets and Apostles imbraced, and for defence of which they were ready to bee killed; This spirituall persecution, as Saint *Augustine* teacheth, exceeds the corporall: They murder the Prophets who contradict the doctrines of the Prophets: *Misus ageris*, it were lesse crueltie in you to thrust your swords into the bodies of the Prophets, then with your tongues to murder the doctrine and words of the Prophets. And a thousand like sayings hath the same *Augustine*, by which it were easie to demonstrate *Baronius* himselfe, and not *Iustinian*, to bee the unjust, impious, sacrilegious, and franticke persecutor, if by that which hath beene said this were not abundantly apparent.

8. Now followeth the other Pageant of this *Baronian* Tragedy in declaiming against *Iustinian*. That respects his last yeares, and his death, in which part, as being the last, and therefore likeliest to leave deepest impression in the hearts of the readers, because *Baronius* hath couched together the most vile accusations of all the rest; and the very venome of his poysonfull affections, and splene, against the Emperour, I am most unwilling to forsake the religious Emperour in the last act of all, but am exceeding desirous to testifie my love unto him, both for other causes, and for this especially, that he, next unto God, was the preserver of the Catholike faith, when in this cause of the Three Chapters, the Nestorians, and especially Pope *Vigilius*, laboured with might and maine for ever to abolish and extinguish the same: in regard of which act alone, if there were none else, hee deserved to bee eternized in the blessed memory, and by the best endeavors of all that love the Catholike faith. *Baronius* intreating of the 37. yeare of *Iustinian*, which was about two yeares before his death, tells us how at that time, *Iustinian*, Vnhappy *Iustinian* ranne headlong into the heresie of the *Aphthardokites*, or incorrupticola: who denied the body of *CHRIST* to bee subject to passions, death, or corruption: These, as *Liberatus* saith, were also called *Phantasticks*, because upon their doctrine it followed, that *CHRIST* had not a true and truly humane, but onely an imaginary and phantasticall body. Into this phantasticall heresie, saith *Baronius*, did *Iustinian* fall, and runne headlong in his last age: and for prooffe hereof hee alleageth \* most ample witnesses: *Authores omnes tam Græci quam Latini*, All Authors both Greeke and Latine, they all testifie that hee fell into this heresie; and they detest that impiety in him; Nor did he onely fall himselfe into it, but hee sought to draw all others into the same error: *Iræbrius factus est, ut mente motus*, *Iustinian* was so drunke, that being out of his wits, hee writ an *Edict* to confirme that heresie, and bring all the Church to beleieve the same: When hee prevailed not that way, then hee began to use violence, *Exilium omnibus Episcopis contradicentibus comminatur*, hee threatened banishment to all the Bishops who contradicted

f An. 563. nu. 1.  
r Euagr. lib. 4.  
ca. 38.  
Lcomi. lib. de scil.  
Act. 10. et Pra-  
teoll. de Hæres.  
hæ. 55. Dice-  
bant carnem  
quam ex virgine  
Servator as-  
sumpsit, ante pas-  
sonem incorrupti-  
bilem fuisse.  
u Liberat. Brev.  
ca. 19.  
x An. 563. nu. 8.  
y Bar. ibid. nu. 9.  
z Illud constat,  
Imperatorem  
hæresin compro-  
basse eandemque  
scripto Edicto fir-  
masset. An. 564.  
nu. 3.  
a An. 563. nu. 12



dicted that heresie, and<sup>b</sup> so boyling in rage, raised a persecution, yea, Persecutionem<sup>c</sup> *haud mediocrem*, an heavy and great persecution against Catholike Bishops, casting Eutychius Bishop of Constantinople into banishment for this cause. Thus Baronius. Who proves this concerning the Edi& and persecution, partly by the Surian Eustathius<sup>d</sup>, who writ the life of Eutychius, partly out of Evagrius, who both mention indeed the banishment of Eutychius, and the Edi& of Iustinian, written for that heresie.

9. This is the summe of that which is objected: but how Baronius doth amplifie, decke, and paint out the same by his Rhetorication, is not unworthy observing. He not onely taxeth this in Iustinian as an act of curiosity,<sup>e</sup> temerity, and arrogancy, for His intermeddling in sacred matters, and of foolishnesse, for Partaking<sup>f</sup> with the one side in the faction, as he had done with the Prasini, for which he<sup>h</sup> calleth him, *Maximum jurium proculcatorem*, The greatest despiser and tramplet of lawes under his feet; but he calls him also *Mente motu*,<sup>i</sup> a man out of his wits, an heretike,<sup>l</sup> another Egyptian Pharaoh,<sup>m</sup> who bent all his power to oppresse the Catholike faith; yea a very Antichrist, saying thus<sup>n</sup> of him, Iustinian no otherwise than Antichrist, setting up his Chaire and Throne in the Temple of God, and extolling himselfe above all that is worshipped, maketh sacrilegious lawes for establishing Infidelity, and writes Edi&s for heresie: And againe, not<sup>o</sup> any reason, but onely the Emperours authority, did erect that heresie; *Tanquam Idolum in Templo Dei*, As an Idoll in the Temple of God. Whereupon the Cardinall<sup>p</sup> in the anguish of his heart, takes up with fighes and teares the complaint of Ieremy, O heavens be astonised at this, be afraid and utterly astonised, the Emperor hath forsaken the fountaine of living waters, & he hath digged to himselfe pits that will hold no water: After this fit of his weeping overpast, he then comes to the most base reviling & railing against the Emperor, calling<sup>q</sup> him *Monstru triceps*, that Monster with three heads (like another Cerberus, or hell-hound) which Ecclesiasticus<sup>r</sup> speaks of, & declares to be so odious & execrable: A poore man proud, a rich man a lyar, and an old man a foole. Such a Monster, saith he, did Iustinian now appeare, (like three-bodied Gerion, in the Poets,) seeing he joyed these three detestable faults in himselfe at this time. Hee was poore, yea most poore, *Expers penitus literarum*; Utterly voyd of learning, not able to reade his very A. b. c. and yet hee would seeme to be more learned than all Bishops: so he was a poore man proud. He was also a rich man, a lyar, in that he commanded all to embrace heresie, and by his power hindreth them to contradict his Edi&: like him of whom it is said, The rich man spake, and all held their peace. Lastly, when he refused the counsell of the Elders, *Plan& senex cognitus est fatuus & insensatus*, He was therein plainly knowne to be an old doting foole, without wit or sense. Thus Baronius: concluding that Emperour to be a monster, an heretike, a hell-hound, a mad man, a lyar, a blockhead, and a very plaine foole: whom all the Christian world hath, and shall for ever, and that most justly, admire for his piety, prudence, and wisdom.

To. Baronius, not content with this so uncivill demeanour, tells us further what mischiefes ensued upon these detestable crimes of the Emperour. Those are of two sorts: the former is publique, concerning

b Vbi elaborat  
a se edictu con  
temni ab ortho  
doxis percepti  
ira exfluens  
magnam perse  
cutionem com  
movit. an. 564.  
nu. 1.

c Ibid. nu. 3.  
d Bar. ibid. ex  
tant vero apud  
Sav. die 6. Apr.  
e Lib. 4. ca. 38.

f An. 563. nu.  
1. & 6.  
g Prasinius eum  
stulte studuisse  
meminimus. an.  
563. nu. 2.

h An. 558. nu.  
13.  
i An. 563. 9.

l An. 565. nu. 1.  
m An. 564. nu.  
21.

n An. 563. nu. 6.  
o An. 564. nu. 1.

p An. 563. nu. 8.

q Ibid. nu. 7.

r Eccl. 29.

r Eccl. 13.

ing both the Ecclesiasticall and civill State. For the Church, *"pacem profligat*, Iustinian drove away peace and quiet from it: *he endangered, atque tandem penitus labefacit fidem*, and at last utterly subverted and overthrew the faith. For the Common wealth, it did *"titubare*, reele and decline into a worse estate, *under this hereticall Emperour*, whom he *y* *accuseth, frigescere*, to have beene cold and carelesse in the government of the Empire. The other mischief, which is private, concerns Iustinian himselfe. For the Cardinalls hatred to Iustinian is not satiate with the evils of this life, he pursues him *ad inferos*, and sitting in the chayre of Radamantus, he approves *"* and applauds that most rash and undiscreeet judgement of Evagrius, *"ad supplicia apud inferos luenda profectus est*, hee is gone to be tormented in hell. Yea the Cardinall proves *"* that he went thither in this manner; *Although it be not in mans power to be present at Gods judgement, and it be utterly unlawfull to judge of the dead; yet according to that irrevocable sentence of God, which is pronounced of all the dead,* *"* Their works follow them, according to this sentence, *eadem ipsa qua hinc abeuntem sequuntur Iustinianum*, those same workes which followed Iustinian when hee dyed, doe as yet crie against him in bookes: and those are *juge bellum*, his perpetuall warre against the Church, which hee continually nourished, (having banished peace which hee found therein) and when hee dyed left it in a flame: his unmeasurable *Sacrilegies*, laying oftentimes his violent hands upon holy Bishops, the annointed of the Lord: his cruelty against innocent Citizens: his covetousnesse, and the rest, which I omit. Thus Baronius: who plainly telling us, that these so many, so heinous crimes, and crying finnes, followed Iustinian out of this life, (and every man knowes that these follow no whither but unto hell) hee most forcibly concludeth, that Iustinian out of all doubt, was carried hence to be tormented in those hellish flames. Never could the Cardinall bee at quier, till besides all those other reviling and disgracefull ignominies which hee hath heaped upon Iustinian, he had brought him into the pit and torments of hell: And yet not there also will the Cardinall suffer him to be at rest, but like a Fiend or Fury, hee still exagitates the Emperour with his virulent tongue and stile, worse than any of all the infernall Ghosts; neither alive nor dead will the Cardinall cease to torment him.

II. Verily I know not where either to begin or make an end in this matter, nor how it is possible for any man with sufficient gravity and severity to castigate the Cardinals insolent, inhumane, unchristian demenour against the most renowned and religious Emperour. Did any of those worthy professors of the civill lawes, but halfe so much abound with leasure, as they doe with excellency of wit and learning, I doubt not but they would (as I doe heartily wish) undertake so honourable a service, not onely to Iustinian, but unto G O D and his Church, as in a just volume to vindicate the Emperours honour from these so many, so malicious, so base & immodest calunies of this *Rhab-secha*. A worke not very laborious, seeing as on the Emperours part there is such abundant store and variety of all vertues and praise-worthy actions to set forth his honour, as no mans stile nor words can equall or come neare the same: so on Baronius part, with whom hee is

*p* An. 563. nu. 1

*x* An. 565. nu. 1.

*y* An. 550. nu. 14

*x* Opinari si cui licet, facilius est invenire qui Evagrii de celsa condemnatione vellet sequi sententiam, quam aliorum, &c.

an. 565. nu. 6.

*a* Lib. 5. ca. 1.

*b* Ap. 565. nu. 6.

*"* Apoc. 4.

*c* Sacrilegiorum immensas, Bar. Ibid.

to contend, there are so many shamelesse and detestable untruths, either devised, or applauded by him, that *Varaginensis* himselfe may seeme inferiour to him in this kinde; and I much doubt, whether so many voluminous bookes, as might equall any two Tomes of his Annals, could bee able to comprehend them all: Meane while that I seeme not to shuffle this burden from mine own to other mens shoulders, I will, with their good leave, I hope, adde somewhat out of those bookes which concerne my own profession, and out of my shallow reading indeavour to free the Emperour from those most dishonorable imputations of the Cardinall.

12. Let us then begin with that which is the substance and ground of this whole accusation, and that is, *The Emperours supposed falling into heresie, and writing that hereticall Edict*: This if we can prove to bee a slander and untruth, all the rest, which the Cardinall builds upon this, and derives from it, will of themselves fall to the ground. First then I doe constantly avouch that imputation of heresie to bee untrue: *Iustinian* neither held that fantastickall heresie of the *Aphthardokites*, nor made any Edict for the defence or propagating thereof, nor did hee banish or persecute any Orthodoxall Bishop for contradicting that heresie: All these are slanderous untruths which the Cardinall hath collected out of others, and maliciously uttered in disgrace of the Emperour: And truly, that very contradiction which is not onely in other writers, but in the Cardinall himselfe, in setting downe this narration, is no small presumption of the untruth thereof. <sup>d</sup> *Evagrius* and *Nicephorus* <sup>e</sup> expressly witnesse, that the Emperours Edict was not at all published. *Theophanes* <sup>f</sup>, (as the Cardinall calshim, or *Paulus Diaconus* as others,) and after him *Sixtus Senensis* <sup>g</sup>, expressly witnesse the contrary, that his Edict *was divulged, & ubique transmissum*, and sent to every place. *Baronius*, not knowing whether was truer, affirmeth them both, though they be expressly contradictory: First, that he did publish the Edict, the Cardinall teacheth, <sup>h</sup> saying, *Iustinian when he saw his Edict, contemni ab Orthodoxis, & pro nihilo duci*; to bee contemned and set at nought by the Orthodoxall Bishpps, then hee raised his persecution. How could that Edict be contemned, unlesse it had been published & set forth for an Edict? or how could they be banished for gainsaying that Edict, which if it was not published, had not the force of an Edict? Againe, that hee did not publish it, the <sup>i</sup> Cardinall likewise tels us, *Hee writ indeed, Non tamen promulgavit de heresi Edictum*, But hee did not publish that Edict. Hee did publish it: hee did not publish it: what truth in those witnesses who thus contradict themselves? If hee did publish it, as the Cardinals *Theophanes*, and *Sixtus Senensis* affirme, then *Evagrius*, and *Nicephorus*, are not herein to bee credited: If hee did not publish it, how is the Cardinals *Theophanes*, or *Senensis* herein to be credited? And whether hee did publish it, or not publish it, the Cardinall who teacheth both, is certainly herein not to bee credited. This disagreement of the witnesses one with another, and of *Baronius* with his one selfe, is no good signe of truth in their Narration.

d *Iustiniani* Edictum minime divulgatum est. Lib. 4. ca. 40.  
e Scriptum id. editum non est. Lib. 17. ca. 30.  
f Hist. miscel. lib. 16. an. 38.  
g *Iustin.* precepit hoc dogma a sacerdotibus publice doceri, et ab omni plebe recipi. Lib. 5.  
Bibl. annot. 186.  
h An. 564. an. 1.  
i An. 565. an. 4.

13. But that *Iustinian* neither published nor writ any such Edict, nor



*Vict. Tun. in  
Chron.*

*LA. Tuf. 39.  
in Necessarium  
putavimus, re-  
sta fidei confes-  
sionem qua in  
sancta Dei Ec-  
clesia predica-  
tur presenti edi-  
cto facere maxi-  
fessav. Edict.  
Iust. pa. 492.  
in Iesus Christus  
est consubstanti-  
alis Patri secun-  
dum Deitatem,  
consubstantialis  
nobis secundum  
Humanitatem,  
passibilis carne,  
impassibilis dei-  
tate. ibid. & V.  
trās naturā in  
proprietas &  
varietate nature  
sue manente,  
facta est unitas  
secundum sub-  
stantiam. ibid.  
o Hoc cum u-  
niversali Ecce-  
lesia consentiens  
eandem confes-  
sionem conserva-  
mus, quam 318.  
Patres in Nicea  
collekti, tradide-  
runt: & post il-  
los, 150. sancti  
Patres, Constā-  
tinopoli expla-  
naverunt: &  
qui in Epheso  
& qui Chalce-  
done convenēte  
docuerunt. ibid.  
pa. 495.  
in an. 483. nu. 8.  
in Lib. de heres.  
o De gest. Franc.  
lib. 3. ca. 8.*

nor held any such phantasticke heresie, a farre more faithfull witness than any of the former, even *Victor B.* of Tunen, who lived in that same time at Constantinople, and who would have triumphed to have had so just an occasion to reprove & disgrace the Emperor, by whom he was imprisoned and banished, doth make evident. Hee plainly sheweth how *Iustinian* continued constant in defence of his owne Edict, for condemning the Three Chapters, and of the synodall Iudgement given therein, even to his death. In his 38. yeare (the very next to that wherein *Baronius* fancieth him to have fallen into heresie,) Hee sent for foure *Africane* and two *Egyptian Bishops*, and both personally by himselfe, as also by some others, he laboured to draw them to the orthodox faith, in condemning with him, and the fift Synod, the Three Chapters: and when he could not prevaile, *Custodia mittuntur*, they were put into prison. In the next yeare, he saith that *Iustinian* placed *Iohn* a condemner of the Three Chapters in the See of Constantinople, *Eutychius* being banished: and to his very dying day, he kept *Theodorus* Bishop of Cabarsussus in banishment, because he would not condemne the Three Chapters. So orthodoxall was *Iustinian*, and so earnest an oppugner of heresies, of those especially which deny either the true humanity, or the true Godhead of Christ, even till his very death, by the certaine testimony of *Victor*, an eager enemy of *Iustinian*. Seeing then he continued constant till his death, in condemning the Three Chapters, and maintaining his owne Edict for the condemning of them: and seeing the condemning of them, or the defence of that Edict is the defence of the true faith, and an oppugnation of all heresies, which deny either the Divinity or Humanity in Christ, specially of that of the Phantasticks, or Aphthardokites, as the very words of his Edict doe declare; it clearly hence followeth from the certaine testimony of *Victor*, that *Iustinian* was so farre from embracing, or making Edicts for that heresie, that he constantly oppugned the same, and even punished all who beleaved or taught as the Aphthardokites did; for in beleaving that heresie, they contradicted the Emperours owne Edict, and the holy Councels, both at Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon: all which the Emperour by this Edict, even untill his death constantly maintained.

14. Why, but *All Writers*, saith *Baronius*, both Greeke and Latine, they all doe testifie that *Iustinian* fell into that heresie. What heare I? Doe *All*, and *All*, both Greeke and Latine? doe they *All* testifie this of *Iustinian*? A vast, a shamelesse, a Cardinall, a very Baronian untruth! Of the Greekes, not *Procopius*, not *Agathias*, not *Photius*, not *Damasceus*, though he entreat of this very heresie; not the Cardinals owne *Suidas*, who quite contrary to the Cardinall calls *Iustinian* ὁρθόδοξος, a most Catholicke and Orthodoxall Emperour. Of the Latines, not *Victor*, by whom as you have seene, the cleane contrary is also testified: not *Liberatus*; and both these lived at the same time with *Iustinian*: not *Marcellinus*: not *Bede*: not *Anastasius*, though such was his spleene against *Iustinian*, that he could not have concealed such a disgracefull crime: not *Aiminius*, of whom I pray you see how well his testimony accordeth with the Cardinall: *Iustinian*, saith he, was aman fide Catholicus, pietate in-

signis,

*genis, equitatis cultor egregius*: for his faith, Catholike; for his piety, renowned, a marvellous lover of equitie, and therefore all things did cooperate to his good: & he addeth, for the whole time of his Empire, (which was 39. yeares) *Imperium felici sorte rexit*, Hee governed the Empire in an happy manner: Not the true *Paulus Diaconus* <sup>p</sup>, who using the like words, saith, that Iustinian governed the Empire in an happy sort, <sup>q</sup> *et was Prince for his faith Catholike, in his actions upright, in judgments just*: and therefore all things concurred to his good: not *Sigebert*, not *Marianus Scotus*, not *Lambertus Staphnaburgensis*, not *Ado Viennensis*, not *Albo Floriacensis*, not *Luiprandus*, not *Conrad Abbas Vesperghensis*, not *Albertus Stadenfis*, not *Otho Frisingensis*, who calls him *Christianissimum ac piissimum Principem*, a most Christian, and most pious Prince, (unfit epithetes for an heretike, or one condemned to the torments of hell) not *Gosofrid Viterbiensis* <sup>r</sup>, who likewise calls him a most Christian Prince, one who established peace in the Church, which rejoiced under him to enjoy tranquillitie: not *Wernerus*, whose testimonie is worthy observing, to see the Cardinals faith and true dealing in this cause: Iustinian, saith hee <sup>s</sup>, was in all things most excellent, for in him did concurre three things which make a Prince glorious, to wit, power, by which hee overcame his enemies; wisdom, by which hee governed the world with just lawes; and a religious minde to Gods worship, by which hee glorified God, and beautified the Churches: So farre is he from teaching him with the Cardinall, to have beene a Tartarean *Cerberus*, or Three-headed monster, consisting of three detestable vices, that he opposeth therunto a Trinity of three most renowned vertues, Fortitude, Iustice, and Piety, of which the Emperour was composed: Not *Nauclerus*, not *Krantzius*, not *Tristemius*, not *Papirius Massonius*, not *Christianus Massenus*, not the *Magnum Cronicum Belgicum*: not the *Chronicon Reiherspergensis*, which <sup>t</sup> testifieth, that he did performe many things profitable to the Common wealth, and so ended his life: Not *Munster*, who saith of him, that hee was a just and upright man in finding out matters ingenious, *Atque haeresum maximus hostis*, and the greatest enemy of heresies: not *Platina*, who <sup>u</sup> saith of *Iustinus*, the next Emperour unto him, hee was *Nulla in re similis Iustiniano*, in nothing like unto Iustinian, For hee was covetous, wicked, ravenous, a contemner both of God and men: whence it followeth, that Iustinian was quite contrary, bountifull, just, religious, an honourer both of God and good men.

15. Now whereas all these (and I know not how many more, I thinke an hundred at least, if one were curious in this search) doe write of Iustinian, and not one of them, for ought that after earnest search I can finde, doe mention his fall in that fantasticke heresie; nay, many of them, as yot have scene, doe testifie on the contrary, that hee was and continued a Catholike, a religious, a most pious, a most Christian, a most orthodoxall Prince, and the greatest oppugner of heresies: what an audacious and shamelesse untruth was it in the Cardinall, to say, that, *All Authors, all, both Greeke and Latine, doe witnesse and detest his impiety, and his fall into that heresie*. Besides these, I must yet adde some other, and those also farre more eminent and ample witnesses, who doe more than demonstrate both the honour of Iustinian, and those

p Lib. 1. de Gest.  
Longob. ca. 25.

q Felici sorte.

r Lib. 5. ca. 4.

s Chron. in Just.

\* An. 504.

t An. 564.  
r Cosmog. lib. 4.  
in Iustin.

u In vita Iob. 3.

those imputations of heresie, and the other disgraces wherewith *Baronius* hath loaded him, to bee most shamelesse calumnies and slanders.

16. The first of these is Pope *Agatho*, one of their \* Canonized Saints: Hee in his 7 Epistle to the Emperour *Constantine Pogonatus*, to prove out of the venerable \* Fathers two natures to be in Christ, tels us, that *S. Cyril*, Saint *Chrysostome*, *Iohn* Bishop of *Scithopolis*, *Eulogius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, *Ephremius* and *Anastasius* the elder, two most worthy Bishops of *Antioch*, & *pro omnibus, amulator vera & Apostolica fidei, pia memoria Iustinianus Augustus*, & above all these *Iustinian* the Emperour of holy memory, a zealous defender of the true and Apostolicall faith, teacheth this, whose integrity of faith did as much exalt the Christian Common-wealth, as by the sincerity thereof it was pleasing unto God: and whose religious memory, *ab omnibus gentibus veneratione digna censetur*, is esteemed by all nations worthy of veneration, seeing the integrity of his faith, set out by his Imperiall Edicts, in toto orbe diffusa laudatur, is spread abroad and praised in the whole world. Thus Saint *Agatho*: Whose words may justly cause all the Cardinals friends to blush and bee ashamed of his Annals. Saint *Agatho* ranks *Iustinian* among the venerable and holy Fathers of the Church: *Baronius* thrusts him among heretikes, Saint *Agatho* preferres him before Saint *Cyril*, Saint *Chrysostome*, *Eulogius*, *Iohn* and *Ephremius*, all learned and worthy Bishops: *Baronius* debaseth him below the most rude and illiterate persons, even below any abcedary Scholler, and calls him a very blocke and a foole: Saint *Agatho* preferres him to that very *Anastasius* the elder, \* surnamed *Sinaita*, because hee came from the wilderness of *Sinai*, whom for maintaining the faith against this very heresie of the *Aphotardokites*, *Evagrius* <sup>a</sup>, and *Baronius* <sup>b</sup> himselfe, calls *surrim munitissimam*, a most strong towre; and yet (as Saint *Agatho* witnesseth) a more worthy and defended towre of faith was our *Iustinian*: *Baronius* <sup>c</sup> makes him and this *Anastasius* to bee contradictory in faith, and *Iustinian* to threaten banishment unto this *Anastasius* for not consenting to the heresie of the Phantasticks: *S. Agatho* commends him for his integrity & sincerity in maintaining the true and Apostolicall faith: *Baronius* condemnes him for an Antichrist, an execrable and hereticall oppugner, yea, persecutor of the Apostolicall faith: *S. Agatho* testifieth that the sincerity of his faith did both please God, and highly exalt the Church and Empire: *Baronius* revileth him, as odious to God, detestable to men, and pernicious, yea, pestiferous both to Church and Empire: *S. Agatho* witnesseth his memory to bee pious, blessed and venerable, and that in all nations: *Baronius* declames against him as accursed, and abominable to all: *S. Agatho* proclaimeth, that all nations, and the whole world doth consent in the praising of the faith, and veneration of the person of *Iustinian*: *Baronius* tels you, that all Authors, both Greeke and Latine, consent in condemning the faith, and detesting the heresie of *Iustinian*. *Vtri creditis?* whether doe you beleieve *Baronius* maliciously applauding an untruth, which hee found in one or two writers, of none, or little credit, or *Agatho* a Pope, a Saint, with whom consent all nations, and the whole world?

x *Martyrol.*  
Rom. l. 10.  
y *Agatho*. Epist.  
exiat. A. 4.  
z *Non desunt*  
autem et aliorum  
venerabilium  
patrum probatissima  
testimonia, &c. *Ibid.*

\* Nam *Anastasius* minor Episcopus  
adeptus est post mortem  
*Iustiniani* ut ex  
*Niceph. Constant.*  
in *Chro. liquet.*  
a *Lib. 4. ca. 39.*  
b *An. 563. 10.*  
c *Ibid. nu. 12.*



17. To Pope Agatho I adjoyne the whole Romane Synod consisting of 125. Bishops, who all together with Agatho give the like honorable testimony of Iustinian. They with Agatho writ a Synodall letter to the same Emperour Constantine, wherein they exhort him to imitate the piety and vertue of Constantine, of Theodosius, of Martian, and of Iustinian the great, *extremi quidem, praestantissimi tamen omnium*, the last indeed (of those who had before assembled generall Councells) but the most excellent of them all, *whose piety and vertue omnia in meliorem statum restituerunt*, restored all things into a better order. Thus that whole Synod: Could they more forcibly have demonstrated Baronius to be a slanderer? Baronius saith that Iustinian was an heretike, a persecutor, an Antichrist, one who dissipated the faith, ruined the Empire, brought an hellish confusion into the Church: for which crimes hee placeth him among the damned in hell. Pope Agatho with his whole Councell, testifie, that by his piety and vertue hee restored all, both the Church and Empire into a better order: they honour him (as much, nay more than they do S. Constantine \*, or Theodosius, or Martian,) for one of the most renowned upholders of the faith of Christ, for one of them, who at their death did not leave nor lose, but onely exchange their imperiall Crowne, and instead of their earthly and corruptible, received the celestially and immarcescible Diadem of immortality and eternall glory: among these, yea and above these Saints and glorified Emperours, as being most excellent of them all, is Iustinian placed and crowned in heaven, by the judgement of Saint Agatho and his whole Councell with him.

d Extat Epist.  
Act. 4. Conc. 6.  
pa. 21.

\* Sanclum Con-  
stantinum, vo-  
cat Papa Steph.  
in Epist. ad Ba-  
sil. Imperat.  
post 8. Synod.

18. If yet you require more or more ample witnesses, behold, the first generall Councell hath approved both those Epistles of Agatho. Of them the whole Synod said, *Petrus per Agathonem loquutus est*; Peter spake by the mouth of Agatho: and againe, *Wc. all consent to the dogmaticall letters of Agatho, & to the suggestion of the holy Synod which was under him, of 125. Bishops.* Of them Constantine said in the name of the whole Councell, *Omnes consonanter mente & lingua*, wee all with one heart and voyce believe and profess, and admire the relation of Agatho, as the divine voyce of Saint Peter. Of them Domitius B. of Prusias sayd, *I receive and embrace the suggestions of the most blessed Agatho, tanquam ex Spiritu Sancto dictas*, as being inspired by the Holy Ghost, and uttered by the mouth of Saint Peter, and written with the fingers of Agatho. Thus doth the whole generall Councell approve those Epistles of Agatho; which their approbation not onely doth remove, but Baronius himselfe extendeth to every part and parcell of those Epistles, saying of them, *In omnibus tum ipse Constantinus, tam sancta Synodus suscepit*, both Constantine & the holy Councell received these in all & every point. And againe, *Epistola Romana missa in orientibus comprobata dicuntur*. The Epistles of Agatho, which were sent from Rome are said to be approved in All things set downe therein. Now seeing the whole generall Councell, by Baronius owne confession, doth in this sort approve the Epistles of Agatho, and therefore those very testimonies concerning Iustinians faith, piety, honour, and eternall blessednesse in Heaven: had not Baronius, thinke you, a face more hard than brasie or adamant,

e In Sermon.  
propheta. Act. 14.  
pa. 89.  
ibid. & Act. 15.  
p. 6.  
Act. 18. pa. 93.

i Act. 8. pa. 29.

k Bell. lib. 4. de  
Pontif. ca. 11.  
S. Vbi et, Act. 6.  
I au. 681. nu. 24

m an. cod. nu. 49

when he reviled in so immodest manner that Emperour, as an heretike, a persecutor of the faith, an Antichrist, a drunken, frantick, and sacrilegious foole, a ruiner of the Church, and carelesse governour of the Empire, yea as one condemned and now tormented in hell, and who sealeth it with this saying, That his heresie is testified by *All authors*; whereas those most honourable testimonies of Pope *Agatho*, and the Romane Synod with him, (which declare *Iustinian* to have beene for faith orthodoxall, for vertue and piety renowned, and held in veneration by all nations, and praised of all the world, and to have beene equall, nay more excellent than Saint *Constantine*, *Theodosius*, and *Martian*, and therefore to be both in his owne person, and in his memory blessed) are approved, and that in this very point, as *Baronius* acknowledgeth, by the sixt generall Councell to be as certaine and as true, as if Saint *Peter*, or the Holy Ghost had uttered the same. Said I not truly, that this cause of the Three Chapters had bereft the Cardinall, not onely of truth, but of judgement, of modesty, of civility, yea almost of common sense, so that he cares not what he sayes, so he speake in defence of those who defend, and in condemnation of those who condemne the Three Chapters, though he knoweth that, which he saith, to be refuted to be a calumny and slander, not onely by historians and private writers, but by the Pope, by the Romane Synod, by the holy general Councell, that is, by the whole Catholike Church, by all Nations, by the whole world, by Saint *Peter*, and by the Holy Ghost himselfe.

19. There might be added unto these, divers other pregnant testimonies; of Pope *Gregory*, who often calls *Iustinian*, a man *Pia memoria*, of a pious memory; of the Legates of *Agatho*, who call him, of *divine memory*; of *Peter B. of Nicomedia* and others, who call him, of *blessed remembrance*; of the Emperour *Constantinus*, who calls him, *divina memoria*; of the sixt generall Councell, which not so little as a dozen times I thinke, calls him, of *pious, or divine memory*, *most holy Iustinian*, or the like; and which, to expresse that great honour which they ascribe to the religious Emperour then present before them, (whom they terme the driver away of heretikes,) proclame him to be a *new Constantine*, a *new Theodosius*, a *new Martian*, a *new Iustinian*, crying out in his honour in divers actions, *Novo Iustiniano aternus memoria*, eternall memory bee to you our new *Iustinian*. A miserable prayse and wish had this beene, had *Iustinian* beene an Heretike, a Persecutor, an Antichrist, a damned person in hell: for then the whole generall Councell had not onely dishonoured *Constantine* there present, but had wished honour and immortall glory to Heretikes, to Persecutors, to Antichrist, yea to the Devill himselfe: which kinde of praying and praying, is not very suitable to the piety and faith of that generall Councell. But the former testimonies are so ample and illustrious, that they seeme to me to obscure all these and the like, and doe so abundantly convince *Baronius* to slander and calumniate the Emperour, that I will forbear to presse him with any more.

20. Perhaps some good friends of *Baronius* will say in his behalfe, and for his excuse, that hee did not devise this of himselfe, nor is hee the

1. Lib. 1. Ind. 11

Epist. 10. & lib.

3. Epist. 4.

1. Con. 6. act. 3.

in Act. 10.

in Act. 18.

o Act. 14. & 16

Act. 8. & 16.

o 17. & 18.

the first that accuseth *Iustinian* of this Heresie: he hath his Books, and his Authors for him. He hath so indeed. And so he hath *Nestorius* and *Theodorus* of *Mopsestia* for his defending *Nestorianism*. He devised not that neither of himself, he doth but secōd others therein. By this apology who may not the Cardinal revile when he list? He may calūniate *Athanasius* for a murderer; *Telesine* and *Cyril* for *Apollinarians*; *Constantine* the great for a persecutor of the true faith; for which crime his son is called an Hereticke, a murderer, a friend of the Devill: Saint *Paul* for a seditious and pestilent fellow, a madman: Christ himselfe for a glutton and drunkard, a man possessed by the devill, a blasphemor. Thus may he revile and accuse these, and al the best men that have ever been in the world, yea even God himselfe, and then salve all with this plaister. Why, *Baronius* deviseth not any one of these imputations; hee can produce his books & authors for the all: and those also far better than he doth for this concerning *Iustinian*. In one he hath the whole Councell of Tyre, in another, *John* Patriarch of Antioch, *Theodoret*, & the Councel which they held at Ephesus; in a third, *Lucifer* Bishop of Calaris, a Confessor, one who suffered whippings and tortures at the Councell of Millan, and after that, exile for the faith: in another, *Tertullus* and *Festus*: in the last, the Jewes, the Scribes, and the High Priest with his Councell: would this excuse either *Baronius*, or any that should upbraid these crimes unto *Athanasius*, *Constantine*, *Paul*, or *Christ*, from being revilers and slanderers. He who applaudeth & abettereth a slander, (as doth *Baronius* this of *Iustinian*) he is as guilty of slander as if himselfe had devised it. The law of God doth not only say, Thou shalt not lye or devise a false tale, but *Thou shalt not receive a false tale, neither shalt thou put thine hand with the wicked* (not be a coadjutor, an accessory, or an abetter) *to be a false witnesse*. Yea though many report an untruth, yet their multitude cannot excuse thee: *Thou shalt not follow a multitude in doing evill; neither shalt thou agree in a controversie to decline after many, and overthrow the truth*. And the Apostles rule \* condemnes not onely those who doe evill themselves, but those also (and that much more) who consent unto, or who favour those that doe evill: accordingly whereunto *S. Ierome* \* saith of wantonnesse, that which is true in all other sins, *majori procacitate defendunt libidinem quam exercent*, it is a greater impudency to defend lust, lying, slander, or any sin, than to commit it.

But let us see who those are on whose report the Card. frames this his slanderous invective against the Emperor. He saith they are all authors. But that, as you have seen, is a vast, and truly *Baronian* untruth. They are but some: and the Card. nameth three, *Evagrius*, *Eustathius*, and *Nicephorus Callistus*. I will yeeld more unto him if he please: let him have 10. or 20. to say what his fore-man doth: yet the law of God is forcible against them, as if they were but one: *Thou shalt not follow a multitude to doe evill*. And alas, what are these, either for number, or (which is more) for gravity and authority, to those which we have before produced? To say nothing of that cloud of Historians: what are they to *S. Agatho*? to *S. Gregory*? to the Emperour *Constantinus Pogonatius*? to the Romane Synode? to the sixt generall Councel? to all nations? to the whole world? to *S. Peter*? yea to the Holy Ghost himselfe?

1 conc. Tyrium  
apud Athan.  
Apol. 2.  
m Conciliab. Iou  
bannis, Ephes.  
supra. et n. 11.  
n Quia noluit  
vis esse Ariana  
idcirco Athanasius  
sum. per quod  
habebat a Ratione  
tua non se sumit  
Lucif. lib. 1. p. 19  
Athan. p. 57.  
Prim. d. 1. barretius  
cus, deinde per se  
enter, etc. et  
amici sui diaboli  
li. ait idem Con  
stantino. ibid.  
p. 12. et 13.  
o. Tertullus  
Act. 24. 5.  
p. Festus, Act.  
24. 24.  
q. Math. 11. 19.  
r. Mark. 3. 22.  
s. Math. 26. 68.  
t. Exod. 23. 1.

u. Ibid. v. 2.  
x. Rom. 1. 32.  
y. Lib. 2. advers.  
Tovin.



What an army of invincible, irresistible Captaines, hath *Iustinian* to fight on his side, against two or three poore, petite, & contemptible witnessses, which the Card. hath raked together, not to be named the same day with the former?

22. Will it please you further to take a view in particular of them? Truly of those whom the Card. would not vouchsafe once to name, I will say nothing: if they were not worthy to be named, nor to have a whistle from the Cardinall, I thinke them unworthy to bee refuted also. This onely I say of them all, they were misse-led and deceived by those whom the Card. mentioneth as his prime and principall witnessses: and those are *Evagrius*, *Eustabius*, and *Nicephorus*. Now for the last of these, *Possesine* shewes him to be hereticall, and in Histori-  
*cal* narrations, erroneous: and the Card. himselfe saith of him, *Fatius iudicandus est*; he is but a foole: and his reason is far worse than his censur, because he is not so virulent and spitefull in condemning the Emperour *Iustinian*, as the Card. could wish him, and as himselfe is: besides, what *Nicephorus* saith, is but borrowed from *Evagrius*, (*Possesine* calls him *Affeclem*, a Page or Ape of *Evagrius*) and therefore the answer to *Evagrius* will be sufficient for him also.

23. His middle witnessse is *Eustabius*, the writer of the life of *Eutychius*, which is set forth by *Surius*. Hee large indeed describeth this matter, both how *Iustinian* fell into this heresie of the *Aphthardokites*, how hee writ an *Edit* for the same, and read it to *Eutychius* B. of *Constantinople*, urging him to approve it; how when he refused so to doe, the Emperour for this cause thrust him from his See, and sent him into banishment; where he lived working abundance of miracles, for the space of 12. yeares, till *Theodosius* the Emperour restored him with great honour. This is the summe of that narration of *Eustabius*, in which the Card. much pleaseth himselfe, as if all that *Eustabius* saith in this matter were an undoubted Oracle, seeing *Eustabius* (as he often boasteth) was present with *Eutychius* in all these occurrents, and an eye-witnessse of them.

24. But why did the Card. mention this worthy record out of *Surius*? could hee finde this writing of *Eustabius* in no better Author than *Surius*? *Surius*, a man so prostitute in faith, so delighted in lyes, and forgeries of this kinde, with which he hath stuffed his *Lives of the Saints*, that at the very first naming of *Surius*, I suspected this *Eustabius* to be but a forged Author, and a fabler: the rather because neither *Photius*, nor *Sixtus Senensis*, nor *Possesine*, (who all writ *Bibliothecas*;) nor *Tritemius*, mention any such *Eustabius* to have writ the life of *Eutychius*. But after I had perused and considered the writing it selfe, I did no longer suspect, but I found (which now I do constantly affirm) that *Surian* *Eustabius* to be so vile & abject a fabler, and so full of lyes, that none but such as *Surius* and *Baronius*, men delighted in applauding forgeries and untruths, can give any credit at all to that *Surian* *Eustabius*. By one or two examples take a conjecture of all the rest.

25. That *Eustabius* describing the entrance of *Eutychius* to the See of *Constantinople*, tells us that after the first generall Councell was summoned, *Eutychius* was sent thither by the Bishop of *Amasea*, (who then was sicke) to supplie his roome in the Councell. *Adonasthen*

a *Nicephorus*  
*Andronicus*  
*consecrat*  
*quid S. Sani*  
*a sile* *Pate* *pro*  
*edite per S.*  
*nam a se*  
*nam promit*  
*garit autem*  
*Poss. in verb.*  
*Nicephorus*  
*Et, habet*  
*in dogmatibus*  
*vero in historica*  
*veritate que*  
*digna sunt*  
*proceduntur.*  
*Ibid.*  
*b. ad. 563. nu. 2.*  
*c. in verbo*  
*grus.*  
*d. tunc (Iustin.)*  
*cepit exco*  
*dem opinionem*  
*probare, que*  
*Christi corpus*  
*incorruptum*  
*asserbat. Eust.*  
*apud Sur. 6.*  
*April.*  
*f. Persuaserunt*  
*Imperator, ut*  
*nam a sede ex*  
*urbaret, in ead*  
*alium constitu*  
*eret, qui opinio*  
*nibus suis con*  
*sentiret: quod*  
*et factum est.*  
*Ibid.*  
*g. Perduravit*  
*exilium Euty*  
*chii (ut idem*  
*author affirmat)*  
*spacio 12. ann*  
*rum et amplius.*  
*Bar. an. 564.*  
*nu. 29.*  
*h. Hec Eustabi*  
*us: Qui his om*  
*nibus presens*  
*aderat. Bar. an.*  
*564. nu. 20. pre*  
*sens affert. nu.*  
*24. et alibi.*  
*i. Locutus.*

Patriarch of Constantinople, exhorted Eutychius not to depart from him; and shewing Eutychius to the Clergie, said of him by way of prophesie (for that Eustathius is full of miracles, propheties, and visions,) unto them; This Monke shall be my successor; and then sent him to the Emperour. Some few dayes after this, Menas dyed: and whereas many sued for the Bishopricke, the Emperour had a vision, wherein S. Peter appeared unto him, shewing him Eutychius, and saying, *Fac ut hic sit Episcopus*, see that this man be the Bishop of Constantinople. The Emperour acquainted the Clergy with his vision, and upon his oath testified it unto them; whereupon they all chose Eutychius, and then he was consecrated. Thus the Surian Eustathius. A narration so sottish and so absurd, that nothing can bee more ridiculous: and so untrue, that there are not so many words as lyes therein. The fift Councell was not summoned till the 26. yeare of Iustinian: and that before then, it could not be summoned, Baronius evidently sheweth: For the summons to the Councell followed, as he saith, <sup>k</sup> the restoring of Vigilius, and his reconcilement both to the Emperour, to Menas, and to Theodorus of Casarea: all which he <sup>l</sup> placeth in the 26. yeare of Iustinian. Now it is certaine by that testimony of the Popes Legates, which <sup>m</sup> before was handled, and was uttered before the sixt generall Councell<sup>a</sup>, and is acknowledged for true by Baronius<sup>o</sup>, that Menas died in the 21. yeare of Iustinian, that is, foure whole yeares at the least before the summons of the Councell, or before Eutychius came to Constantinople, being sent from the Bishop of Amasea. What a dull and doltish legend now is this of Eustathius? to make Eutychius come and converse with Menas, to be brought by him to the Clergy, to be designed and prophetically foretold by Menas to bee his successor; when Menas was dead foure whole yeares before he did any of these things? what a prophane fiction is it, to make the Emperour see a vision, and Saint Peter to command him to take care that Eutychius should be chosen, and the Emperour to avouch all this upon his oath to be true? whereas not one syllable thereof is true, or so much as possible; seeing Eutychius was actually placed in that See full foure years before this vision, or before Saint Peter gave that strait charge unto Iustinian. They who can beleefe these phantasticall dotages of that Surian Eustathius, (and Baronius <sup>p</sup> applauds this with the other narrations in that Eustathius) little marvell, if upon his report they upbraid that which is every way as incredible, that Iustinian fell into that heresie of the Phantastickes, and banished Eutychius for not consenting to the same.

26. Of no more truth is that which the same Eustathius sets downe for the continuance of the banishment of Eutychius, which was, the space of twelve <sup>m</sup> whole yeares, untill Tiberius was <sup>n</sup> associated into the Empire by Iustinus, and in the same yeare when Iohn<sup>o</sup> the successor to Eutychius dyed. For Theophanes, as the Card. calls him, as other (though amisse) Paulus Diaconus, but the author of the *Miscella. Historia*, expressly witnesseth <sup>p</sup> that Iustinus (who began his reigne two yeares after the banishment of Eutychius) was crowned by Eutychius. And Zonaras <sup>q</sup> for a certainty relates, how that (before Tiberius was associated) when Iustinus was sicke, he called, besides others, Eutychius unto him, and in their presence

le Sicq animi  
iunctu restitu-  
toq Romano P<sup>o</sup>  
tifice in pristi-  
nam dignitatem  
inducta est oec-  
umenica Synodus  
an. 553. nu. 14.  
l an. 552. nu. 19.  
et 30.  
m Sup. ca. 16.  
nu. 18.  
n Act. 3.  
o an. 860. nu. 48

p an. 553. et  
an. 564. et alibi  
m <sup>p</sup> ex Eusta-  
thio notat Ba-  
ron. an. 564. 29.  
et an. 578. nu.  
3. 5. 6.  
n Ad Iustinum  
et Tiberium ex-  
clamant, ut fidei  
custos (Eutychi-  
us) redderetur:  
qui id concesser-  
unt. Verba Eu-  
stath. Suriani.  
loc. cit.  
o Bar. an. 578.  
nu. 5.  
p Iustinus Im-  
perator corona-  
tus ab Eutychio  
Patriarch. lib. 18  
Hist. Miscel.  
q Zonaras. 10. 3. in  
Iustin.

x Vere cognovi-  
 mus Deum mi-  
 sisse Angelum  
 suum & eripu-  
 isse, &c. Eustat.  
 I Iustinus per se  
 solus ad annos  
 12. regnavit, &  
 cum Tiberio an-  
 nos 3. Evagr.  
 Lib. 5. ca. 23.  
 t Hoc anno, de-  
 functo Johanne,  
 revocatus est  
 Eutychius exul.  
 an. 578. nu. 5.  
 u Em G. Moras  
 z. Niceph. in  
 chro.  
 x Nam Iustinus  
 solus totidem  
 annos regnavit  
 sup.  
 y Ab Anastasio  
 Bibliothecario  
 datus Chronolo-  
 gia interprete.  
 & Chronolo-  
 gia Nicephori  
 conversa in La-  
 tinum per Ana-  
 stasium. Titulo  
 Nicephori in  
 Biblioth. S. Pat.  
 20. 7.  
 z Johannes an.  
 12. mens. 7.  
 a Johannes sedit  
 an. 12. mens. 7.  
 ut habet Nice-  
 phori Chronicon.  
 Bar. an. 564.  
 nu. 29.

nominated Tiberius to be his partner in the Empire: for Iohn, saith he, being dead, Eutychius was reduced from banishment, & restored then to his See, and that Tiberius was crowned by the same Eutychius. Which evidently demonstrates the vanity of that whole Eustathian Narration, wherein it is said, that after the Empire of Tiberius begun, the people came to them to entreat the restoring of Eutychius: that the Emperors upon their supplication, sent post haste to Amasea to bring him home out of banishment: that the Angell of God brought him miraculously thence: that the people flocked unto him in every place: that they laid their sicke in the way, that at least the shadow of this second Peter might touch them, and according to their faith they were cured: that he came like another Messias, riding on the Colt of an Asse into Constantinople, the people cutting downe boughes, & spreading their garments for him, and so was with admirable joy received by the Emperors, and the whole City. Not one word of all which is true, seeing Eutychius was long before the time of Tiberius restored from banishment, at the least 11. or 12. yeares, even ever since the crowning of Iustinus: who reigned 12. yeares alone, before he assumed Tiberius into the society of the Empire. This will be further evident by those words of Nicephorus Patriarch of Constantinople, on which Baronius relieeth, Eutychius was recalled from banishment, as the Cardinall teacher, and that rightly, in the same yeare wherein Iohannes Scholasticus (who was placed in his roome) died. Now Iohn was Bishop, as Nicephorus witnesseth, but two yeares and seven moneths. Whereupon it certainly followeth, that Eutychius was recalled within three yeares after his banishment, that is, in the very first yeare of Iustinus, upon whom hee set the Crowne, at the solemnity of his first Coronation, as was shewed out of the *Historia Miscella*: and this was full twelve yeares before Tiberius was made Emperour. Which demonstrates, not onely the untruth and manifold lyes of that Surian Eustathius, but another hand, some trickes of legerdemaine in Anastasius and Baronius. For Anastasius seeing belike that it was needfull (for saving the credit of some such like fabler as this Eustathius is) that Iohn should bee Bishop twelve yeares, he translating the Greeke Nicephorus, in stead of two yeares seven moneths, puts in twelve yeares and seven moneths, and gives so many unto Iohn before Eutychius bee restored: and Baronius finding this account in the Anastasian translation, followeth it, and saith, Nicephorus ascribes twelve yeares to Iohn: whereas, not Nicephorus, nor his Greek edition (which hath onely two yeares and seven moneths) but the Anastasian falsified and corrupted Latine translation hath the other untrue and false accompt of twelve yeares and seven moneths. This, if nothing else, might be sufficient to refute the whole fiction of that Surian Eustathius, the untruths whereof Baronius could not defend, but by applauding the untrue and falsified writings of his fellow *Bibliothecarius*.

27. Perhaps you will demand, why then did Iustinian banish Eutychius, if not for refusing to consent to his opinion and heresie of the Aphthardokites, as Eustathius saith? which doubt seemes the greater, because Nicephorus the Patriarch in his Chronology mentioneth the same cause, saying thus, Eutychius was cast out of his See by Iustinian, eo quod non reciperet edictum ipsius de corpore Christi experte omnis labe factionis



*factionis*, because *Eutychius* would not consent to his Edict, that Christ's body was incorruptible. See here againe I pray you, and detest for ever the vile and shamelesse dealing of *Anastasius*. *Nicephorus* saith not so; all that hee<sup>e</sup> saith, is, that *Eutychius* was banished because hee would not receive or consent unto the Edict of *Iustinian*; but that which followeth his Edict *de corpore Christi incorruptibili*, wherein is contained the heresie slanderously objected to *Iustinian*, of that *Nicephorus* hath not one word in his Greeke text; that is wholly pacht to him in the Latine translation by the false hand of *Anastasius*, the Arch-corrupter of all writings in his time, as I have \* before more at large declared: And yet so are they delighted with lyes, & corrupted writings, this Latine translation, thus vilely falsified by *Anastasius*, is set<sup>d</sup> in their *Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum*; which much better deserves to be called a Library of forged or corrupted Fathers, and Writers.

c *Niceph. in c. diu. Græca.*

\* *Sup. cap. 17.*

d *Tom. 7.*

28. But for what other Edict, if not for this of the Aphthardokites, was *Eutychius* banished? for that he was expelled from his See, there is no doubt, that being testified not onely by the Surian *Eustathius*, *Zonaras*, *Glicas*, and others, but by *Victor*<sup>e</sup>, who then lived, and was at *Constantinople* when these things fell out, to whom alone more credit herein is to be given, than to five hundred of the Surian records. Truly, whatsoever was the cause why he was banished, certaine it is; that this heresie of *Iustinian*, or any Edict made for it, was not the cause thereof: But there are two other matters, the one, or both of which may very well be thought to have incensed *Iustinian* against him: The former was this; *Eutychius* pretended a Prophetical skill whereby hee could foreshew who should succeed in the Empire; and hee began to tamper and practice this Art about some three yeares before *Iustinian* dyed, as that *Eustathius* delareth. At that time<sup>e</sup> hee privately called *Iustinus* unto him, and told him that he should succeed in the Empire after the death of *Iustinian*, for so<sup>e</sup> (said he) God hath revealed unto mee. The like good fortune hee foretold to *Tiberius*, that heere long he should have the Empire alone. Againe, two yeares before the death of *Tiberius*, hee prophesied of *Mauritius*, that<sup>i</sup> hee, and none but hee should have the Empire after *Tiberius*; idque juramento asseruit, and hee confirmed this by an oath. Now this Art of Divination, and Mathematicall predictions, especially when they prognosticate of Kings their deaths, & successours, was never allowable in any wise State, nor acceptable to any prudent Emperour. It betokened no good to *Caesar* that they foretold<sup>k</sup> him of those dismall Ides of *March*. *Domitian* was foretold<sup>l</sup>, not onely of the yeare, but of the day, and the very houre when hee should dye; and when he had carefully looked to himselfe on that day, enquiring<sup>m</sup> the houre, his owne men of purpose told him the sixt, in stead of the fift: hee then thinking all danger to be past, was by the Conspiratours, (who kept a better watch of the time than he did) securely murdered. What mischiefe ensued upon that prediction to *Valence*, that one whose name did begin with *Theod.* should succeed unto him, *Socrates*<sup>n</sup> declareth; Hee thereupon murdered most unjustly all whom he could finde to be called either *Theodori*, or *Theo-*

e *In Chron.*

f Tribus circiter annis ante Imperium Iustini. Eust. apud Syr. g Significavit mihi Deus te post annum et unum tuum fore Imperatorem. Ibid. h Nunc in parva reipublica gubernacula commisit Deus; non autem et finem concedet. Ibid. i Verè (inquit) non est alius (qui succedet) quam Mauriti- us. Ibid. k Suet. in Iul. Cæs. cap. 81. l Suet. in Domit. cap. 13. m Ibid. cap. 16.

n Lib. 4. cap. 154

dotti,

doti, or Theodosij, or Theoduli, or Theodosioli, or beginning with those letters. What hurt followed as wel in this kingdom, upon that prophesie G. should succeed unto Edward the fourth; as in the next, when it was foretold the Earle of Athel, that hee should be crowned before hee dyed, who thereupon never ceased to rebell against his Sovereigne, till hee was crowned with an hot burning iron, our owne Chronicles doe declare. All kingdoms, all Stories are full of like examples. It was not without cause, that in the Code & both of Theodosius and Iustinian, there are so many, and so severe lawes against this kinde of Mathematicall diviners, their Art & being called *damnabilis, & omnibus interdicta*, a damnable Art, forbidden to all; the punishment denounced against them, being banishment, yea, death; *supplicio capitis ferietur*, hee shall bee put to death who practiseth the curiositie of divining: Now Eutychius taking upō him this Art of divining, contrary to those severe and Imperiall Edicts ratified by Iustinian, whether for this cause the Emperour, who by the law might have deprived him of his life, did not chuse rather to deprive him onely of his See, and liberty, I leave to the judgement of others.

29. The other cause was a most impious heresie defended by Eutychius, whom they so much honour; which alone being duely considered, overthroweth that whole fabulous Legend of Eustathius. Eutychius, when hee had long continued in the defence of the truth, did afterwards fall both by words and writing to maintaine the Heresie of Origen and the Origenists, denying Christs body after the resurrection to have beene palpable, that is in effect, to bee no true humane body; and the very like hee taught of the bodies of all other men after the resurrection: This the Surian Eustathius quite over-passeth in silence; for it was not fit that such a Saint as Eutychius, so abundāt in miracles, prophecies, and visions, should be thought guilty of so foule and condemned an heresie: But Pope Gregory doth so fully and certainly testifie it, that no doubt can remaine thereof; hee tels us, how himselfe disputed against Eutychius, defending this heresie; how hee urged those words of our Saviour, *palpate & videte*, how Eutychius answered thereunto, that Christs body was then indeed palpable to confirme the mindes of his Disciples; but after they were once confirmed, all that was before palpable in Christs bodie, in subtilitatem est redactū, was turned into an aërial and unpalpable subtilty; How he further strived to prove this by those words of the Apostle, *Flesh & blood cannot inherit the kingdome of heavē*; how then (said hee) may this be beleevd, *veraciter resurgere carnem*, that true bodies did or shall rise againe? How he further insisted on those words, *That which thou sowest is not the same body which it shall be*: proving thereby that which riseth againe either not to be a body, or not a palpable; that is, no true humane body. Gregory also tels us, that Eutychius writ a booke in defence of this heresie, which both himselfe read, and Tiberius the Emperour after diligent ponderation of the reasons of Gregory against it, caused it publicly to be burned, as hereticall: adding, that Eutychius continued in this heresie almost till the very houre of his death. Now although Gregory tels not when, or at what time Eutychius fel into this heresie, yet it may wel be supposed, that as Iustinian honoured him so long as he persisted in the truth,

p Tit. de Mathematicis, et his similibus.

q Leg. 2. cod. tit. Cod. Inst.

r Non solum urbe Roma, sed etiam omnibus civitatibus pelli decernimus.

s. ult. Tit. de malef. Cod. Theod.

t Leg. 4. tit. de Malef. Cod. Inst.

et leg. 4. Cod. Theod.

u Greg. lib. 14. Moral. ca. 29. Eutychius scripsit quod corpus nostrum in illa resurrectionis gloria erit impalpabile.

v Libellum de Resurrectione scripsit, ostendens quod caro vel impalpabilis, vel ipsa non erit.

truth, so when once hee gave himselfe to such dotages of the Origenists, (which, as is senned, he did about the latter end of *Iustinian* Empire, some three yeares before his death) then the Emperour, who till his end was constant in condemning the *Three Chapters*, as *Pistor* sheweth, (the condemning of which is, as before we declared, the condemning of all the heresies of *Origen*, and whatsoever contradicts the verity of Christs deity, or humanity) as it is most likely, exiled him for this heretical opinion: And this is much more probable, seeing *Iustinian* had purposely set forth, long before this, a most religious and orthodoxall Edict or Decree, particularly against *Origen*, and the Origenists, as *Liberatus* sheweth, and as the Edict it selfe, which is extant, doth manifest, condemning them in particular, for denying the verity of Christs, and other humane bodies after the resurrection. Seeing then *Nicophorus* the Patriarch saith, that *Eutychius* was banished for not consenting to the Emperours Edict, and *Eutychius* by his defending of that heresie of the Origenists, directly oppugned that his Edict; most like it is, that (besides his Mathematicall Art, whereby hee was liable both to death and banishment, by the Emperours lawes) this Edict of *Iustinian* against *Origen*, should bee that which *Nicophorus* the Patriarch meant, and for which *Eutychius* was, and that most justly, exiled. So not *Iustinian*, but *Eutychius*, was the heretike; nor was it any hereticall Edict of *Iustinian*, (as the Surian *Eustathius*, and after him *Baronius* affirmeth) to which *Eutychius* a Catholike opposed himselfe, but an orthodoxall and Catholike Edict of *Iustinian*, which *Eutychius*, then an heretike, and Origenist, oppugned, for not consenting whereunto hee was banished. Thus not onely the Emperour is clearly acquitted of that phantasticall heresie, whereof the Surian *Eustathius*, and *Baronius* doe accuse him; but *Eutychius* himselfe, whom they honour for a Saint, a Prophet, and a Demi-god, is found guilty of that selfe-same crime, and of that very heresie of denying the truth of Christs body, which they unjustly and slanderously impute to *Iustinian*. And this I thinke is abundant to satisfie the Cardinals second witnessse, namely that fabulous and legendary Surian *Eustathius*.

30. All the Cardinals hope, and the whole waight of his accusation relies now on *Evagrius*. He, I confesse, saith well neere as much as *Baronius*, against *Iustinian*, accusing him of avarice, injustice, and heresie. But the credit of *Evagrius* is not such, as to countenance such calumnies. *Evagrius*, in some matters wherein hee followeth Authors of better note, is not to be contemned, but in very many hee is too credulous, fabulous, and utterly to be rejected. What credit can you give unto this Narration of the Monke *Barsanuphius*, whom he reports to have lived in his Cell, wherein he had shrowed up himselfe, and for the space of fifty yeares and more, neither to have bene seene by any, nor quidquam alimenti cepisse, nor to have received any nourishment, or food? What a worthy S. doth he describe *Simeon Stylita*, that is S. Foole, to have been? How doth he commend *Symeon*, whom they persuaded to be baptized, and undertake the function of a Priest, though hee did not consent to the doctrine of the resurrection, neque in conspectu vellet, neither would beleve that it was possible? The like might

*Hoc cap. nu. 13*

*u Cap. 13.  
x Apud Hist. eccl.  
138. m. 33. d.  
Hist. eccl. 2. 34.  
d. 8.  
y (Quoniam  
hoc quoniam  
dignum est)  
An. 4. 1.*

*a Evag. lib. 4. ca.  
32.*

*b Lib. eccl. ca. 33*

*c Lib. 1. ca. 35.*



d Lib. 2. ca. 3.

might bee noted, touching the blood of *Euphemia* <sup>e</sup>, and divers other Narrations, *Evagrius* is full of such like fables; but omitting the rest, I will propose onely two, which will demonstrate him to have beene either extremely negligent in the search, or very malicious in perverting the truth.

e Lib. 1. ca. 8.

f Narrat ipse  
Nestorius se in  
eo loco quadri-  
miffacho com-  
moratum, & po-  
stea relegatum  
ad Oasis. Lib. 1  
cap. 7.  
g Sac. lib. 7. ca.  
34. & Liber.  
Brev. ca. 7.  
h Epist. Joban-  
nis, et Orienta-  
lium Cyrillo, 10. 5  
Act. Ephes. ca. 5  
& ca. 17.  
i Lib. 7. ca. 39.

31. The former concernes *Nestorius* Bishop of Constantinople, and his successor *Maximianus*. *Evagrius* saith <sup>e</sup>, that *Maximianus* took the Bishopricke after the death of *Nestorius*: An untruth so palpable, that none can thinke *Evagrius* to have bin ignorant of those manifold and undoubted records which testifie the contrary: For it appears by the writings of *Nestorius*, set downe also in *Evagrius* <sup>f</sup> himselfe, that after his deposition, hee stayed at *Ephesus*, and about *Antioch*, for the space of foure yeares, and then was exiled to *Oasis*. Now *Maximianus* was placed in the See of Constantinople, that very same yeare, wherein the Ephesine Councell was held, and *Nestorius* deposed some three or foure months after the same deposition, as *Socrates* and *Liberatus* declare. The next year after the Councell, the union was made between *Iohn* & *Cyrill*, *Iohn* & the rest with him professing expressly in their letters <sup>h</sup> of union, that they acknowledge & receive *Maximianus* for Bishop of Constantinople: A demonstration, that *Maximianus* was Bishop of Constantinople, three whole yeares at least before the death of *Nestorius*: Nay, which argueth *Evagrius* to have doated in historicall relations, *Maximianus* was dead, and *Proclus* placed in his See long before the banishment of *Nestorius* to *Oasis*, much more, before his death; for *Maximianus* was Bishop but two yeares and five months, and hee dyed before the Ides of *Aprill*, when *Ariobindus* and *Asper* were Consul; and before he was buried, was *Proclus* placed in the See the same yeare, as *Socrates* witnesseth. Now *Nestorius* lived foure yeares at *Ephesus*, and about *Antioch*, after his deposition, and some while also in banishment at *Oasis*, as *Evagrius* himselfe affirmeth: So that by *Evagrius* Narration *Maximianus* was made Bishop of Constantinople two yeares after his death; and both *Proclus* and *Maximianus* were Bishops at once of that See. So well doth *Evagrius* relate matters of fact, and such credit is to be given unto him.

k Lib. 4. ca. 26.

32. The other concernes the fable touching the Epistle and Image of Christ sent to *Abgarus*, which *Evagrius* <sup>k</sup> paints out at large, and in most lively colours: He commends the Epistle as a true writing of Christ, and celebrated by the Ancients; Hee calls the Image sent to *Abgarus*, a most holy Image; He tels you, it was not made by the hand of man, but framed immediately by God; that Christ himselfe sent it to *Abgarus*, when he was desirous to see him; that by reason of this Image and writing kept at *Edeffa*, it was famously reported and beleevd by all the faithfull, that the City of *Edeffa* should never be conquered: (that Image made it unconquerable) Hee addes, the event did confirme that prediction to bee true. Hee saith, that when *Cosroes* besieged the City, and had almost taken it, then the *Edeffanes* brought forth that divine Image, and laid it in a ditch, to keepe away the Engines wherewith *Cosroes* intended to destroy the City, and that by this meanes *Cosroes* was faine to returne home, not onely without the victory, but with great ignominie: and for confirmation of this,

this,

this, hee saith, *Procopius* hath related this concerning *Edessa*, and the *Epistle of Christ*. This is the Narration of *Evagrius*, which for the worthinesse thereof is approved and applauded by their second Nicene <sup>a</sup> Synod: n Ad. 5. pa. 354

33. By this now Judge of the fidelity, & truth, not only of *Evagrius*, but of their Nicene Councell and *Baronius*; for in this whole narration there is not a fillable of truth, it is nothing but a fardle, or dunghill of lyes. First, whereas *Evagrius* fathereth this on *Procopius*, that is utterly untrue: In *Procopius* there is not any mention either of *Abgarus* or of Christs Epistle, or of that Image made without hands, or of any prædiction touching the unconquerable City of *Edessa*, or that the *Edessanes* brought forth any such Image in the time of the Siege, or that they laid it in the ditch, or that by the meanes of it *Cosroes* was vanquished; all these are the fictions of *Evagrius*, and those also quite contrary to the true relation of *Procopius*; for hee <sup>o</sup> ascribes the repulsing of *Cosroes* from the City, to the noble military skill and stratagem of the *Romane* Captaines; by reason whereof when *Cosroes* perceived his attempt to bee in vaine, hee made peace with the *Romanes*; but yet so, that the *Romanes* yielded to pay unto him, quinquaginta millia aureorum, those fifty thousand pieces of Gold, which hee at the beginning of the siege demanded, and for which he offered to desist from warre. o Proc. lib. 1. de bel. Pers.

34. Againe, whereas *Evagrius*, to justifie that lying prædiction, as divine and propheticall, such as the faithfull then beleevved as a prophesie of God, saith, that the Event did prove it to bee true; in that, *Evagrius* proves himselfe to bee so extremely false, that almost nothing in him may be credited, but certainly not for his authority: for in the first yeare of *Heraclius*, (at which time it is not unlike but *Evagrius* lived, for he writ his history but some sixteen years before) the event plainly demonstrated the contrary, and this to bee no divine prophesie, but a lying fiction; Then the *Persians* came against *Syria*, saith the Author \* of the miscella: historia, & ceperunt *Edessam*, and they won and took *Capessa* and *Edessa*, and proceeded as farre as *Antioch*, yea, *Cosroes* then so prevailed against Christians, that *Heraclius* was faine to send many Legacies to intreat peace, offering to pay what tribute hee would impose; but the *Persian* disdainfully answered, Non parcam vobis donec Crucifixum abnegetis & adoretis Solem; I will not spare you, till you renounce the profession of Christ, and with us adore the Sunne. How did their *Palladium*, that divine Image, now defend them? or how could that bee a divine prædiction; which for such *Evagrius* commends, and saith, the event proved it to bee true; when the event within lesse than twenty yeares after demonstrated it to bee a lye? \* Lib. 18. an. 1. Heracl. p Ibid. an. 3. & an. 4. & an. 8. q Rogavit ut desisteret tributis, et pacem acciperet. Ibid. r Ibid. an. 8. & Zonar. 10. 3. lib Heracl.

35. But that which is the principall fault in this narration, is, that *Evagrius* approves, as true and certain, that Epistle of Christ sent to *Abgarus*, which is indeed the ground of the whole fable. Now that Epistle to be a reprobated and rejected writing, & condemned by the Church, is so cleare, that their owne Writers proclame the same. Bishop *Cassianus*, among other bookes which the Church (as hee saith) rejecteth, recites *Epistolam Iesu ad Abgarum*, and *Historiam Eusebij*; these two by

<sup>f</sup> Loc. Theol. lib. 11. c. 6. Rejicitur

1 Bibl. Sauc. li. 2.

2 Enebir. Tit. de  
Sac. Scrip. Palam.

3 Concil. Rom. I  
sub Gelaf.

by name, the Church (saith he) rejecteth; & because some ignorant persons thought that touching *Eusebius* History not to be the words of *Gelasius*, and the Councell, *Cannus* refuting those, gives this, as the reason why *Eusebius* is rejected, because in it is set downe the Epistle of *Iesus* to *Abgarus*, quam *Gelasius* explodit, which Epistle *Gelasius* doth hisse out of the Church. This Epistle of *Iesus* to *Abgarus*, saith *Sixtus* *Senensis*, Pope *Gelasius* inter scripturas Apocryphas rejicit, doth reject among other Apocryphall writings. *Coster* their Jesuit saith, *Eusebius* relates how Christ sent a letter to *Abgarus*, but that letter was never, pro ejusmodi accepta ab Ecclesia, esteemed for such, (that is, not for Christs) by the Church. But the words of *Gelasius*, & the whole Roman Councell with him, are of all most remarkeable: They having expresseed and named a long Catalogue of such fabulous writings, and particularly this Epistle of Christ to *Abgarus*, (which *Evagrius* approveth) set downe this censure of them all; These, and all like unto these, wee confesse to bee not onely refused, but also eliminata, cast out of the Church by the whole Romane Catholike and Apostolike Church, atque cum suis authoribus, authorumque sequacibus, sub anathematis indissolubili vinculo in aeternum constemur esse damnata, and wee confesse as well these writings, as the Authors and the followers also of them to bee eternally condemned under the indissoluble bond of an Anathema. So *Gelasius* and the whole Romane Councell: whereby it is evident, that not onely this Epistle, and the Author of it, but that the followers of the Author, the approvers of that Epistle, that is, *Evagrius*, and the whole second Nicene Synod, and *Baronius* himselfe; that these also are anathematized; condemned and accursed by the judgement of the whole Romane Catholike Church, and that also by an indissoluble bond of an Anathema. Such an untrue and fabulous, yea miserable and accursed witness hath the Cardinall chosen of *Evagrius*, by the warrant and authority of whom hee might insult upon, and revile the Emperour: but now the Cardinall hath farre more neede to excuse *Evagrius* from lies, than by his lying reports to accuse others; and now hee may clearly see that censure of condemnation, which hee, with *Evagrius*, most rashly and unjustly objecteth to the Emperour, to fall on *Evagrius*, their second Nicene Fathers, and the Cardinals owne pate; since they all, by approving that Narration touching *Abgarus*, or being sequaces of the Author thereof, are pronounced to bee eternally condemned by the judgement of the whole Romane Catholike Apostolicall Church: It is fit such a censure should ever passe on them, who open their mouthes in reviling manner against religious and holy Emperours, the anointed of the Lord.

36. You doe now evidently see, not onely *Iustinian* to bee cleared of those odious and indigne imputations of heresie, tyranny, persecution, and other crimes, which the Cardinall in such spitefull manner upbraided unto him, but all those witnesses whom hee hath nominated, and produced in this cause, to be so light, and of so little account, that they are utterly unworthy to bee put in the scales or counterpoised with those honourable and innumerable witnesses, which, (as wee have shewed) doe with a loud and consenting voyce proclame, that



that Faith, Piety, Prudence, Iustice, Clemencie, Bounty, and all other Heroicall and Princely vertues have shined in *Iustinian*, which have beautified any of the most renowned and religious Emperors that the Church hath had. Let us now proceed to those effects which *Baronius* observeth to have ensued upon the heresie of *Iustinian*, and the persecution raised by his maintaining of the same. Now indeed this whole passage might justly be omitted, for, *sublat a causa tollitur effectus*; seeing *Iustinian* held no such heresie as hee is slandered withall, there neither was, nor could there bee any effects or consequents of a cause not existent: Yet will I not so sleightly reject the Cardinals calumnie in this point, but fully examine, first the publike, and then the private mischiefs, which hee, without all truth hath fancied, and objected against the Emperour.

37. The publike was partly the subversion and overthrow of the faith, and partly the decay of the Empire in the time, and under the government of *Iustinian*. *Disertus esse posset*; Hee that would in an elaborate speech refute this calumnie of *Baronius*, might have an ample scope to display all his Art and skill in this so large an argument: My purpose is onely to point at the severall heads, and not expatiate at this time. Truly, the Cardinall could hardly have devised any calumny more easie to be refuted, or more evidently witnessing his malicious and willfull oppugning of the truth. I will not insist on those private testimonies: of *Procopius*,<sup>a</sup> *Iustinian* seemeth to have beene advanced by God to that Imperiall dignitie, *ut totum Imperium repararet*, that he might repaire and beautifie the whole Empire: Of *Otob*,<sup>b</sup> *Iustinian* being a most valiant and most Christian Prince, *Imperium quasi mortuum resuscitavit*, did raise the Empire as it were from death to life, and exceedingly repaired the Commonwealth being decayed: Of *Gotofrid*,<sup>c</sup> The whole glory of God was repaired by his vertue, and the Church rejoyced in the stable peace which under him it enjoyed: Of *Wernerus*,<sup>d</sup> Hee was in all things most excellent, and by his just lawes, and wisdom he governed the world; by his impiety he glorified God: Of *Amonius*,<sup>e</sup> He was a Catholike, a pious, a just Emperour, therefore all things prospered under his hands. I oppose to that Baronian calumny, the judgement of Pope *Agatho*, and of the Romane Councell with him, wherein this is expressly witnessed, <sup>f</sup> His integritie in faith did much please God, & exalts the Christian Commonwealth: and againe <sup>g</sup> His vertue and pietie, *omnia in meliorem ordinem restauravit*, restored all things into a better state and condition: All, both Church and Commonwealth, both the Civill and Ecclesiasticall state: he restored all. I oppose the sixt generall Councell, that is, the judgement of the whole Church, in wch the suggestions of *Agatho*, evē in that point, according to the Cardinals doctrine<sup>h</sup>, are approved as uttered by S. Peter, yea, by the holy Ghost himself. These pregnant and irrefragable testimonies of so many, so holy, and divine witnesses, are able, I say not to confute, but utterly to confound & overwhelme *Baronius* wth his deformed & deceptiv calumnie.

38. If any further please to descend to particulars, whether hee cast his eyes on the Church or Commonwealth, he shal see every Region, every Province, almost every City & Towne proclaiming the honour of *Iustinian*: Besides, his happy appeasing of those manifold broyles,

H h

and

<sup>a</sup> Lib. 3. de adif. Justin. pa. 4336

<sup>b</sup> Lib. 5. ca. 4.

<sup>c</sup> In Chron. part. 16. in Justinian.

<sup>d</sup> An. 504.

<sup>e</sup> De gest. Fr. lib. 2. ca. 8.

<sup>f</sup> In Epist. Agath. Act. 4. Conc. 6. pa. 18. a.  
<sup>g</sup> Ibid. in Epist. Synod. pa. 22.

<sup>h</sup> Vid. sup. lib. cap. nu. 18.

and suppressing sundry heresies which infested the Church in his dayes, among which this concerning the *Three Chapters* was the chiefe: How infinite monuments did he leave of his piety and zeale to Gods glory & the good of his Church, in building new, in repairing decayed Churches, reducing both to a most magnificēt beauty: The Church of *Christ* called *Sophia*, built by him at Constantinople, was the mirror of all Ages: Of it *Procopius*, an eye-witnesse, testifieth, <sup>i</sup> that the magnificence thereof amazed those who saw it, but was incredible to those that saw it not: the <sup>k</sup> height of it mounted up into the heaven, the splendor of it was such, as if it received not <sup>l</sup> light from the Sun, but had it in it selfe; the rooffe deckt with Gold, the pavement beset <sup>m</sup> with Pearle; the silver of the Quire onely contained foure \* *Myriads*, that is, forty thousand pounds; in so much that it is said <sup>n</sup>, to have excelled the Temple of Salomon. Further, in the honour of the blessed Virgin hee builded every where so many houses, so stately and sumptuous throughout the Roman Empire, that if you should contemplate but onely one of them, you would thinke (saith *Procopius* <sup>o</sup>) his whole raigne to have beene employed in building that alone. At Constantinople he builded three *P*, one in *Blacernis*, another in *Pege*, a third in *Hierio*: besides others builded in honour of *Anna*, of *Zoa*, of *Michael*, of *Petr* and *Paul*, of *Sergius* and *Bacchus*, *atrumque fulgore lapillorum Solem vincit*, either of which, by the brightnesse of precious stones, excelled the Sunne; of *Andrew*, *Luke* and *Tymothy*, of *Acatius*, of *Mocius*, of *Thirs*, of *Theodorus*, of *Tesla*, of *Theodora*: *Hac omnia ex fundamentis erexit*, All these he raised from the very ground and foundation: and that at Constantinople; the beauty and dignity of which cannot by words bee expressed, by viewing be perlustrated. Nor did he this to one onely Citie; he builded like magnificent Churches, at *Antioch* <sup>q</sup>, at *Sebastia*, at *Nicopolis*, at *Theodosia*, at *TZani*, at *Iustiniana* <sup>r</sup>, where hee was borne, at *Ephesus* <sup>s</sup>, at *Helena*, at *Nice*, at *Pythia*, at *Ierusalem*, so magnificent, ut nullum aliud equipare possit, that none other may compare with it; at *Iericho*, at mount *Gerazim*, at mount *Sinai*, at *Theopolis*, at *Aegila* <sup>t</sup>, where they sacrificed to *Iupiter Hammon* and *Alexander the great*, even to that time; at *Boreion*, at *Tripolis*, at *Carthage*, at the *Gades*, or *Hercules* pillars, which was the uttermost border of the known world in those dayes: So that one may truly say of him, *Imperium Oceano, famam qui terminat astris*; his piety and zeale reacheth as farre as the earth, his honour as high as the heaven. And yet have I said nothing at all of the *Monasteries*, *Zenodochies*, *Nosodochies*, and other like *Hospitals*, which, out of his most pious affection to God and Gods Church, he not onely erected, but enriched with large patrimonies and possessions, which for number are as I suppose equall, for expences greater, than the former: all the particulars whereof I referre to be read in *Procopius*, who considering, beside other matters, al these magnificent and sumptuous buildings, did truly say of *Iustiniā* <sup>u</sup>, *Nulla honorandi Dei satietas eum cepit*, he was never wearied, never satiate with honouring of God.

40. After the Church, wil it please you to take a view of the civil state & Empire. No mans tongue or pen can equall or come neare his acts, and most deserved praise. The whole Empire at the beginning of his reigne was in a maner spoyled & defaced. In the East, the *Perliās* held

a great

<sup>i</sup> Proc. lib. 1. de  
edif. Iustin. pa.

423.

<sup>k</sup> Assurgit in altitudinem celi.

Ibid.

<sup>l</sup> Diceret locum illum non exterius sole illuminari. Ibid.

<sup>m</sup> Pavimentum ex diversis coloris unionibus perfectum. Glie.

Annal. part. 4.

\* *Myriadas* 4.

calati argenti

habuisse fertur.

Proc. loc. cit.

<sup>n</sup> Hoc edificium

Solomonem esse

superatum. Glie.

loc. cit.

<sup>o</sup> Lib. 1.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid.

<sup>q</sup> Pro. lib. 2.

<sup>r</sup> Lib. 4.

<sup>s</sup> Lib. 9.

<sup>t</sup> Lib. 6. pa. 453.

<sup>u</sup> Lib. 1. pa. 424

a great part of Asia; in the South, the Vandals possessed Africk; in the West, the Goths usurped Italy, and Rome it selfe; in the North, the Franks, Almannes, and other people withdrew Germany, France, and other Northerne Countries. *Iustinian*, finding the Empire thus torne asunder on every side, freed it from all these enemies; and having most happily subdued, and gloriously triumphed over them all, by his victorious conquests, hee purchased those manifold titles, which are so many Trophees, Crests, and Ensignes of his immortall honour, to bee surnamed *Iustinian the Great*<sup>b</sup>, happy<sup>i</sup>, renowned, victorious, and Triumphant *Augustus*, *Alamanicus*, *Gothicus*, *Francicus*, *Germanicus*, *Anticus*, *Alanicus*, *Vandalicus*, *Africanus*: So at once he purchased both honor to himselfe, and peace and tranquillity to the Empire. Neither did he this only by his conquests, and recovery of those great Nations, which the Empire had lost; but further also by his prudence hee so fortified them, being recovered, by building and repairing their ruinated Cities, by erecting Castles, Forts, and strong places of munition; by furnishing them all with the commodities of waters, of wals, of promontories, of havens, of bridges, of baths, of goodly buildings, and other matters, serving either for the necessity or pleasure of habitation, that the whole Empire by his wisdom and government was made, as it were, one great and strong City, both commodious and delightful to his owne subjects, and inexpugnable to his enemies: So in Media hee fortified Doras<sup>k</sup>; in Persia, Sifauranon; in Mesopotamia, Baros; in Syria, Edessa, and Callinicum; in Commagine, Zenobia; in Armenia, Martyropolis<sup>l</sup>; in the other Armenia, Theodosiopolis; in Tzani, Burgunocic; *Totam<sup>m</sup> Europā inaccessam reddidit*; he made the whole Country of Europe unconquerable: Tauresium, where he was borne, hee exceedingly fortified; and beautified, and called it *Iustinianea*; the like hee did to Vlpiana, and called it *Iustinianea secunda*: neare to it he builded *Iustinopolis*; he repaired all Epyrus, Aetolia, Acarnania, *Vniversam Graciam*, he fortified all Greece: the like hee did in Thessalia, and Euboea, *Quam penitus inexpugnabilem & invictā reddidit*, which hee made inexpugnable: The like hee did in Thrace, in Misia, and in Scythia also; in Libya<sup>n</sup>, in Numidia, and at the very Gadés. Time would faile me to recount the one halfe of his famous buildings in this kinde, they may bee read in *Procopius*, who thus concludeth, *Nulli<sup>a</sup> dubium est*, no man may doubt, but that *Iustinian* fortified the Romane State with munitions, and strong holds, from the East unto the West; and to the very utmost borders of the Empire: Who further in admiration of these workes of *Iustinian* not onely cal<sup>b</sup> him, *Orbis reparatorem*, the repairer of the whole world, but adds this memorable saying of him, *That there hath<sup>c</sup> not beene any in all ages, nor among all men, more provident, more careful for the publike good, than Iustinian, unto whom nothing was difficult, no not to bridle and confine the Seas, to level the Mountaines, and overcome those things which seeme impossible*.

40. Even *Evagrius* himselfe, whose spite and spleene was (as I conjecture by some welwiller of the *Three Chapters*, of which there were divers in the time of *Gregory*, when *Evagrius* writ) incensed against *Iustinian*, could not chuse but testifie this. <sup>d</sup> *It is reported of him, that*

<sup>b</sup> *Iustiniani magni. Epist. Agath. et Symod. Rom. Act. 4. Conc. 6. i In prefat. Iustinian. Iustinian.*

<sup>k</sup> *Inexpugnabilem hostibus effecit. Proc. lib. 2. de adif. Iust. Ibid. lib. 3. m Lib. 4.*

<sup>n</sup> *Lib. 6.*

<sup>a</sup> *Lib. 6. pa. 456.*

<sup>b</sup> *Lib. 4. pa. 439.*  
<sup>c</sup> *Quapropter nemo contemderit, per omnem aetatem fuisse quempiam ex omnibus hominibus Iustiniano magis providum, & accuratorem. Lib. 4. pa. 440.*  
<sup>d</sup> *Evagri. lib. 4. ca 18.*



hee restored anew, an hundreth and fifty Cities, which were either wholly overthrowne, or exceedingly decayed, and that he beautified them with such & so great ornaments, with houses both private and publike, with goodly walles, with faire and sumptuous buildings, and Churches, *ut nihil possit esse magnificentius*, that nothing can bee more magnificent: So hee. And yet all these Buildings, Munitions, Castles and Forts, are not comparable to those most wholesome *Imperiall Lawes*, whereby hee most wisely ordered & governed the whole Empire: that alone was a work of so great value & excellency, that I may truly say, that all his victories & victorious triumphs over the Persians, the Gothes, the Vandals, and other nations, never gained so much honour unto him, as did that his more than *Herculean* labour in composing and digesting the lawes, to the unspeakeable benefit of the whole Christian world: for as by his victories and buildings, he restored but the materiall Cities and wals thereof, so by this he repaired the men themselves, and their mindes, reducing them from rude and barbarous behaviour to civility and order, setting them in such a constant forme of civill government, as all Christian Kingdomes since have not onely with admiration extolled, but with most happy successe embraced and followed.

41. Iudge now, I pray you, uprightly of the Cardinals dealing, who declames against this Emperour, and reviles him in most odious terms, as an *unjust, avaricious, sacrilegious, tyrannicall person*, calling him a *dolt, a foole, a mad-man, an heretike, an Antichrist, a persecutor of the faith, negligent of the civill, disturber of the Ecclesiasticall State, under whom the Empire and Common-wealth decayed, and declined, the Church was oppressed, and the faith overthrowne*: Whereas it doth now appeare by evidences of all sorts, that hee was a Prince, not onely Catholike, pious, prudent, magnanimous, just, munificent, and most vigilant for the good, both of the Church and Common-wealth, but so adorned with the concurrence of all those heroicall vertues, which have beene single in other men of great fame, as if in him we should see the compleate Idea of a worthy Emperour; hee being for politicall prudence, *Solon*; for valour and victorious conquests, *Alexander*; for magnificence, *Augustus*; for his piety, constant love and zeale to the faith, *Constantine*; *Theodosius* or *Martian*; for multiplicity of labours, undertaken for the good of the whole Empire, more indefatigable than *Hercules*; and for supporting the whole fabricke of the Church and Christian faith, a very *Atlas*; *Calum qui vertice fulcit*.

42. There onely remaineth now the other effect, which is private: which as it is the last, so is it the heaviest punishment that *Baronius* could wish unto *Iustinian*, and that is, *his adjudging him to the pit and torments of hell*. Did he not feare the Apostles reproofe, either against rash and temerarious judgers, *Who art thou that judgest another mans servant?* or against uncharitable censures, *Charity thinketh not evil* & it rejoyceth not in iniquity, but rejoyceth in the truth. why did not the Cardinall harken rather to the judgement of the Church of *Constantinople*? Wherein the memory<sup>h</sup> of *Iustinian* was yearely celebrated, and that with great pompe and solemnity in the Church of *Sophia*, in the time of divine service, all the people being assëbled. The like celebrity<sup>i</sup> of his memory

f Rom. 14. 4.  
g 1 Cor. 13. 5.  
h In ipso Dei  
Verbi Sapientie  
templo quotannis  
magnificè me-  
moriæ ejus  
celebrari, populi  
universi conci-  
one ad rem di-  
vinam coacta.  
Nicep. lib. 17.  
ca. 31.  
i Ibid.

was observed at Ephesus in the Church of Saint Iohn, which he had builded. Or if the authority of these particular Churches could not sway the Cardinall, seemed it a small matter unto him to contemne the conferring judgement of Pope Agatho, and his Romane Councell; which ranke him among the glorious and blessed Saints in heaven, with Saint Constantine, Theodosius, and Martian? yea, of the whole sixt generall Councell; wherein his memory is so often called, *holy, blessed, divine, happy, and the like?* & if his memory, then much more himselfe is happy and blessed; for to the just onely doth that honor belong, *The immortall of the just shall be blessed, but the name of the wicked shall rot.* To which purpose that is specially to be observed which Nicephorus addeth in plaine termes of the sixt generall Councell, *Iustinianum beatus quiete dignatur*, It placeth Iustinian in blessed rest and peace: and againe, *Semper cum qui in Sanctis est Iustinianum dicunt*, That general Councell ever calleth Iustinian one who is a Saint, and among the Saints. Adde to all these, that seeing, by the Cardinals confession, the Epistles of Agatho, *In omnibus* (and therefore even in that which he saith of this holy Emperour, *That hee is a blessed Saint, venerable in all Nations*) are to be imbraced as divine Oracles, it may bee truly concluded, that Iustinian, not onely by the testimonies of mortall men, and of all nations, but even by the voyce of God himselfe is blessed; and hath ever since his death, and doth now rest; and raigne with God. When by the impartiall judgement of S. Agatho, of the Romane Synod, of the whole sixt generall Councell, of all Nations; yea, of God himselfe, Iustinian is proclaimed to be a venerable Saint, now resting & reigning with God in heaven: who is Baronius, a man of yesterday, that after a thousand years possession of that heavenly rest, he should unfaint him, dethrone him, and thrust him downe to the lowest pit and most hideous torments of hell? Is't not enough for that Hildebrandicall generation to deuest Kings & Emperors of their earthly diadems, unless in the pride of their hearts climbing up into heaven, they thrust them out thence also, & deprive them of their crowns of immortality, & eternal glory?

43. And yet were there neither Historian nor Pope, nor Provinciall, nor Generall Councell, to testifie this felicity of Iustinian unto us; that very text, out of which, being maimed, the Cardinall sucked poison, and collected His death & damnation, doth so forcible prove the beatitude of Iustinian, that it alone may bee sufficient in this cause. The Cardinall cites but one part of the text, but the whole doth manifest his fraud and malicious collection. Apoc. 14. 13. *Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from hence forth; even so saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labours, and opera illorum sequuntur illos*, their workes follow them: which last words the Cardinall onely alleageth, and applyeth them to Iustinian. Now who are Those, that are meant by, *Their workes*; and follow Them? who are those Them, that the Spirit meapeth in that text? Out of al doubt those selfe-same of whom before he spake, *Them, that dye in the Lord, Them, that are blessed, and rest from their labours*. Of Them, the Spirit there saith, *Opera illorum*, Their workes follow Them. Seeing then the Cardinall confesseth this text to belong to Iustinian, and himselfe applyeth it unto him, it certainly hence followeth, that

*Iustinian* is of their number, who dye in the Lord, and are blessed for of *Them*, and *Them* onely doth the holy Ghost speake in that text, saying, *They rest from their labours, and Their workes follow Them*. So hard it is for the Cardinal to cite or say ought against *Iustinian*, which doth not redound to the Emperours honour, and the Cardinals owne ignominie.

44. But let us suppose the words to bee generall, as being uttered alone, without any reference to that text, they may bee truly affirmed both of the good & bad : There cannot be found in al Scripture more faire evidence, nor a more authentike Charter for the happy estate of any one in particular that lived since the Apostles times, then is this for *Iustinian* : For what were those *workes which did accompanie, and follow Iustinian* ? Truly the workes of sincere faith, of fervent zeale to GOD, of love to the Church and Children of God, the workes of piety, of prudence, of justice, of fortitude, of munificence, of many other heroicall vertues : with these, as with a garment and chaine of pure Gold, *Iustinian* being decked, was brought unto the Bridegroom; every decree made, or ratified by him for confirming the faith, every *Anathema* denounced against heresies, & heretiks, particularly those against *Vigilius*, & al that defend him, that is, against *Baronius*, and all who defend the Popes infallibility in defining causes of faith; everie Temple or Church, every Monastery and Hospitall, every City and Towne, everie Bridge, Haven and High-way, every Castle, Fort, and Munition, whether made or repaired by him, tending either immediately to the advancement of Gods service, or to the maintaining or relieving of Gods servants, or strengthening the Empire against his and Gods enemies : every booke in the Digest, Code, and Authentikes; every Title, yea, every law in any title, whereby either the Christian faith and religion, or peaceable order and tranquillity, have beene either planted, or propagated, or continued, either in the Church or Common-wealth : all these, and every one of them, and many other the like, which I cannot either remember, or recount, are like so many Rubies, Chrysolites, and Diamonds in the costly garment, or so many linkes in that golden chaine of his faith and vertues. Seeing they, who offer but one mite into the treasury of the Lord, or give but one cup of cold water to a Prophet, shall not want a reward; O! what a weight of eternity and glory shall that troope of vertues and traine of good workes obtaine at his hands, who rewardeth indeed every man according to their workes, but withall rewardeth them infinitely above all the dignity or condignity of their workes.

45. If *Iustinian* and those who are beautified with so many vertues and glorious workes, be, as the Card. judgeth, tormented in hell, belike the Cardinall himselfe hoped by workes contrary unto these, by workes of infidelity, of impiety, of maligning the Church, of reviling the servants of GOD, of oppugning the faith, of Patronizing heresie, yea, that fundamental heresie which overthroweth the whole Catholike faith, and brings in a totall Apostasie from the faith; by these hee hoped to purchase, and in condignity to merit the felicity of the Kingdome of Heaven: This being the track and beaten path where-




in they walke, and by which they aspire to immortality, what *Constantine* sayd once to *Aceſius* the Novatian, the ſame may be ſayd to *Baronius* and his conſorts, *Erigito tibi ſcalam Baroni, & ad cælum ſolus aſcendito*, Keepe that Ladder unto your ſelves, and by it doe you alone climbe up into heaven. But well were it with them; and thrice happy had the Cardinall beene, if with a faithfull and upright heart towards God, he could have ſaid of *Iuſtinian* the words of *Balaam*, *Let me dye the death of the righteous, and let my laſt end be like his*. His life being led in piety, and abounding in good workes, hee now enjoyeth the fruit thereof, felicity and eternall reſt in *Abrahams* boſome: As for the Cardinall who hath ſo malignantly reviled him, himſelfe can now beſt tell whether he doth not cry and pray, *Father Abraham have mercy on me, and ſend Iuſtinian that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and coole my tongue*: or ſing that other note<sup>n</sup> unto his fellowes concerning this Emperour; *Wee fooles thought his life to be madneſſe, and his end to bee without honour, but now is he numbred among the children of God, and his lot is among the Saints*: Therefore wee have erred from the way of truth, and wearied our ſelves in the wayes of wickedneſſe and deſtruction; we have gone through deſerts where there lay no way, but as for the way of the Lord wee have not knowne it.

m Sac. lib. 1. ca. 7.

n Wiſd. 4. 6.

CAP. XXI.

How Baronius revileth Theodora the Empresse, and a refutation of the ſame.

1.  Ext the Emperour, let us ſee how dutifully the Cardinall behaveth himſelfe towards the Empresse *Theodora*. A ſmall matter it is with him in ſeverall places to call her an<sup>a</sup> *impious*, an *hereticall*<sup>b</sup>, a *ſacrilegious*<sup>c</sup>, a *furious*<sup>d</sup> *hereticall* woman, a *patrone*<sup>e</sup> of *heretikes*, and the like. Heare and conſider how he ſtormeth but in one place<sup>f</sup> againſt her: *Theſe ſo great miſchiefes did that moſt wicked woman beginne; ſhe became to her husband another Eve obeying the ſerpent, a new Dalila to Samſon, ſtriving by her ſubtiltie to weaken his ſtrength; another Herodias, thiſting after the blood of moſt holy men; a wanton mayd of the High Prieſt, perſwading Peter to deny Chriſt*. But this is not enough, *Sugillare ipſam*, with theſe termes to ſtout her, who exceedeth all women in impiety, let her have a name taken from Hell, let her be called *Aleto*, or *Megera*, or *Tiſiphone*, a Citizen of hell, a child of Devils, raviſhed with a ſatanicall ſpirit, driven up and downe with a devilliſh gad-bee, an enemy of concord and peace purchaſed with the blood of Martyrs. Thus the Cardinall: who tells us afterwards how when *Vigilius* came to *Conſtantinople*, ſhe contended long with him for to have *Anthemius* reſtored, in ſo much that *Vigilius* was forced to ſmite her as from heaven, with the thunderbolt of Excommunication<sup>g</sup>, whereupon ſhe<sup>h</sup> ſhortly dyed. Here is the tragicall end which the Cardinall hath made of her.

a Impia Theodora Auguſta. an. 535. nu. 591.  
b Heretica ſamina impia Theodora. ibid. nu. 60.  
c Sacrilega ſamina molita eſt. an. 536. nu. 123.  
d A ſurente heretica ſemina excitata. an. 538. nu. 9.  
e Ipſa hereticarum, Accephalarum, Severianorum, Eutychianorum patrona. an. 547. nu. 49.  
f An. 535. nu. 63.  
g Sententiam excommunicationis inſixiſſet, et, Excommunicationis ſententia fulminis inſer calicem emiſſi proſtravit. an. 547. nu. 49.  
h 50.  
i Theodora & Vigilio ſanciatam diro jaculo anathematiz, haud diu poſt ulciſcente numine, eſt inſequens interitum. an. 548. nu. 244.

2. Now

1 Liber. ca. 21,  
22.  
k Eusgr. lib. 4.  
ca. 10.

2. Now I would not have any think that I intend wholly to excuse the Empreſſe; ſhe had her paſſions and errors; as who hath not? and as *Liberatus*<sup>1</sup> and *Evagrius*<sup>k</sup> ſhew, ſhe tooke part with the oppugners of the Councell of Chalcedon: which was for ſometime true; ſhee being, as it ſeemes, ſeduced by *Anthimus*, whom for a while ſhe laboured to have reſtored to the See of *Conſtantinople*: though afterwards, as *Viſtor Tununenſis* teſtifieth, ſhe being better informed, joynd with the Emperour in condemning the *Three Chapters*, and ſo in truth, in defending the Councell of *Chalcedon*, though *Viſtor* thought the contrary. And of this minde in condemning the *three Chapters* ſhee was, as by *Viſtor* is evident, ſome yeares before *Vigilius* came to *Conſtantinople*. Her former error, ſeduction, and labour for *Anthimus*, I will not ſeek to leſſen, or any way excuſe. But though ſhe were worthy of blame, was it fit for the Cardinall ſo baſely to revile her, and in ſuch an unſeemly and undutiſull manner, to diſgorge the venome of his ſtomacke upon an Empreſſe? *tanta ne animis caſteſibus ira*, who would have thought ſuch rancour and poiſon to have reſted in the breaſt of a Cardinall? But there was, you may be ſure, ſome great cauſe which drew from the Cardinall ſo many unſeemly ſpeeches againſt the Empreſſe; and though hee would bee thought to doe all this onely out of zeale to the truth, which *Anthimus* the heretike oppugned, yet if the depth of the Cardinalls heart were ſounded, it will appeare, that his ſpite againſt her, was for condemning the *Three Chapters*, which Pope *Vigilius* in his *Conſtitution* defendeth; *Anthimus* and his cauſe is but a pretence and colour; the *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution*, the heresies of the *Nestorians*, decreed and defined therein, that is the true marke at which the Cardinall aymeth; neither Emperour nor Empreſſe, nor Biſhop, nor Councell, nor any may open their mouth againſt that *Conſtitution*, which toucheth them *in capite*, but they ſhall be ſure to heare and beare away as harſh and helliſh termes from *Baronius*, as if they had condemned the *Trent* Councell it ſelfe. Had *Theodora* defended the *Three Chapters*, as *Vigilius* in his *Conſtitution* did, the Cardinall would have honoured her as a *Melpomene*, *Clio*, or *Vrania*; becauſe ſhe did not that, ſhe muſt be nothing but *Aleſſo*, *Megara*, or *Tiſiphone*, and they are too good names for her.

1 In annal. ſuis.  
pa. 87.  
m Participem  
conſilij ſumen-  
tes eam qua à  
Deo eſt data no-  
biū, reverendiſ-  
ſimam conjugem.  
Novel. 8. ca. 1.  
n In pragmatica  
ſanctiōne Juſtin.  
ca. 1.  
o Ad Inſtinianū  
& Theodoram  
divæ memoriæ.  
Conc. gen. 6. Act.  
14. p. 73. Bi-  
ſita aſſi Concilij.  
& Ad Theodo-  
ram piā memo-  
riā quondam  
Auguſtām. Act. 3  
pa. 11.

3. If one deſired to ſet forth her praiſe, there wants not teſtimonies of her dignity, and honour. *Conſtantine Manasses*<sup>1</sup> ſaith, that ſhe was *iſdem addicta cum marito ſtudiis*, & *iſdem pradita moribus*: that ſhe ſo well conſorted to her huſband, that ſhee was addicted to the ſame ſtudies, indued with the ſame manners as he was: That *Inſtinian* himſelfe calleth her<sup>m</sup>, *reverendiſſimam conjugem*, his moſt reverend wife, given unto him by God: adding that he tooke her as a partner with him of his counſells in making his lawes, and after her death he<sup>n</sup> calleth her *Auguſtām piā memoriā*, Empreſſe of holy memorie, as doe alſo and very often the ſixt general Councell: an unfit title to be given to an heretike, or a fury, either by a holy generall Councell, or by a Chriſtian orthodox Emperour, who was ſo earneſt with the ſixt Councell to condemne all that ſhould obſtinately perſiſt in the condemning of the true faith, and dye out of the communion of the holy Church. Divers the

the like testimonies might be alledged, if one would labour to extoll that Empresse, as the Cardinall hath strained his wit and pen to vilifie and disgrace her. But because that is not my purpose at this time, I would onely observe how unjustly the Cardinall hath taxed her in respect of three severall times, and three speciall matters.

4. The first concernes the placing of *Anthimus*, an Eutychean heretike in the See of *Constantinople*, which *Baronius* saith was done by *Iustinian*, *occultis insidiis Theodora*, by the cunning and trecherous meanes of *Theodora*; and thereupon hee breakes into many uncivill termes. Wherein the Cardinalls spite and indiscretion is utterly unexcusable: for whatsoever *Anthimus* was secretly and in his heart, he at that time when he was placed in the See, and afterwards also, outwardly shewed and professed himselfe to bee a Catholike; he was a wolfe, as the *Archimandrites* and Monkes of *Constantinople*, *Ierusalem*, and other parts of the East doe witness, in their synodall Epistles to *Agapetus*; but he covered himselfe, and his wolvishe conditions, under sheepes clothing. Again, hee and others, *religionis pietatem dissimulantes*, counterfeiting the piety of religion, thrust themselves into the Church. *Anthimus* lived not an Euangelicall (that is, sincere,) *sed fictam vitam*, but a fained and hypocriticall life, manifesting forth to all men the counterfeited continuency of his government, and the shew of piety which by it he made. The Emperour testifieth the same; *Anthimus* forsooke and refused those true doctrines which hee often seemed to love, *simulans sequi sanctas quatuor Synodos*, faining himselfe to follow the foure holy Synods. The whole generall Councell under *Mennas* in their definitive sentence against *Anthimus* do expressly witness the same, *He counterfeited himselfe to embrace and receive the foure Councells*, and he kept them in *diptichis*. Again, he used *deceptibilibus rationibus ad ejus Serenitatem*, deceitfull and cozening meanes before the Emperour; promising to doe all things which the Apostolike See (then Catholike) did decree, and hee writ to the most holy Patriarchs, *Se sequi per omnia Apostolicam sedem*, that he did in all things follow the Apostolike See: when *Anthimus* made so holy, and orthodoxall a profession, better than which no Catholike could desire; what marvell if by this faire shew, and outward orthodoxy, hee deceived both the Emperour, and the Empresse, and the whole Church? They were not, nor could they looke into his heart; it was their duty to judge him to bee such in deed, as he shewed and professed himselfe to be, a Catholike Bishop: and taking him for such, they placed him in that high Patriarchall See. Did not *Constantine* the great the like, and without any just blame or reprehension, receiving into great favour *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, and others, though inwardly and in heart most pestilent Arians, yet in outward profession orthodoxall, and embracers of the Nicene faith? Nay, what if *Baronius* himselfe acknowledge, that neither *Theodora* nor *Iustinian*, advanced *Anthimus* the heretike; but *Anthimus* then seeming, and being in their judgement a Catholike? Heare I pray you his owne words, *The Empresse favoured Anthimus, uti orthodoxo, as an orthodoxall Bishop: and Iustinian sent a Constitution to him, ut orthodoxum Antistitem, as to an orthodoxall Bishop. He did outwardly professe the Catholike faith, but inwardly*

p *Iustinianus Augustus con- jugem audient, monstrum horrendum in sedem Pontificiam pro- veht. an. 535. nu. 60.*  
q *Ibid. nu. 61. & 63.*  
r *Libell. Archi- mand. et Monac ad Agapetum in Conc. Constantinop. sub Menn. act. 1. pa. 426. a. f Pa. eadem. b.*

r *Iustin. Consti- tutio contra Severum, Anthimus. &c. que extat post Conc. sub Menna. pa. 469. a.*  
u *Sent. Synodi contra Anthimū. act. 4. pa. 438. a.*

x *an. 535. nu. 62.*

y *an. eod. nu. 59.*

was



*z an. cod. nu. 86* was an Eutychian. Again, the <sup>z</sup> Fox had so ordered himselfe, that being a most abominable heretike, *Studeret tamen in omnibus apparere Catholicus*, yet he endeavoured every way to seeme a Catholike, approving the Councell of Chalcedon, and all that true Catholikes did; yea and when there was a rumour spread of him to bee an heretike, the crafty companion throughly purged himselfe of that crime, when in plaine termes he professed before the Emperour, that he would in all things assent to what the Apostolike See did prescribe: these things being dissembled by *Anthimus*, his hypocrisie and heresie were not detected, untill <sup>a</sup> *Agapetus* the next yeare came to Constantinople; in the meane space he was held for a professor of the Catholike faith, a communicator with the Apostolike See, by reason of his publike profession, wherein he openly before all mens eyes, and before the Emperour himselfe, professed to receive all things which the Apostolike See did prescribe. Thus *Baronius*. By whose words it is most cleare that *Anthimus*, when hee was placed in that See of Constantinople by the meanes of the Empresse, was not knowne to her, nor discovered to the Church, as yet, to be an heretike, nor a full yeare after: hee was held & reputed by all for a Catholike, and very orthodoxall Bishop. What fault was this now in *Theodora* or *Iustinian*, to place him in this See, whom they knew for no other than a Catholike? who professed to hold the foure former Councils, and promised to yeeld to whatsoever *Agapetus* a knowne Catholike did prescribe. Nay, seeing by *Baronius* owne confession, the Empresse did then favour him *in orthodoxo*, no otherwise than as being orthodoxall, she even therein testified her orthodoxy in faith at that time, as favouring him *eo nomine*, because she thought him to be orthodoxall. So farre was she in this act either from being an heretike, or deserving those epithetes & titles, which the Cardinall hath fetcht from hell to bestow upon her, that in very deed by the Cardinals words she deserveth praise and honour.

*b* Anast. in vita  
Vigil.  
*c* an. 547. nu. 49

*c* Theodora elicit  
à Vigilio ut  
tria Capitula  
condemnet.  
Vid. Tan. in  
Chron. an. 2. post  
Coss. Basilij.

5. The second point concernes the bienniall contention with *Vigilius* for restoring of *Anthimus*, which out of *Anastasius* <sup>b</sup> *Baronius* hath borrowed: all which is nothing but a meere fiction and legend patched up by *Anastasius*, as elsewhere I shall further explaine. *Vigilius* was neither called, nor came about that businesse to Constantinople, but about the *three Chapters*; the cause of *Anthimus* was some ten yeares before ended: the Empresse knew the resolution of *Vigilius* therein, that he had absolutely refused to restore him. And though for a while after the deposition of *Anthimus*, shee, being deceived by his faire words and shew of piety, sought to restore him: yet when shee saw *Anthimus* to remaine an obstinate heretike, and to oppugne the faith of Chalcedon, shee quite left off all striving for *Anthimus*, and became with *Iustinian* a condemner of the *three Chapters*, (as *Victor* <sup>c</sup> testifieth) that is in truth, an earnest defender of the Councell of Chalcedon, and of the Catholike faith. So unjustly doth the Cardinall take occasion upon an untruth and legendary fable to revile the Empresse as an heretike.

6. The third and last point concernes the direfull thunderblast of Excommunication, which *Vigilius* the Romane *Iupiter* cast from heaven

ven against *Theodora*, wherewith belike she was smit to death. Where in though the Cardinall<sup>d</sup> is exceeding brag, and thinkes his saying to be warranted by no meane witnessess, but by Pope *Gregory* himselfe: yet for all that, I must be bold to tell him that it also is a fiction, and that *Vigilius* brought no such Ioviall darts with him to *Constantinople*, or if he did, he spent them not upon the Empresse. It was Pope *Agapetus*, and not *Vigilius*, by whom (if by any) *Theodora* was excommunicated, seeing *Theodora* did contend with *Agapetus* about *Anthimus*, and that also before his deposition. It was he which called *Theodora*, *Eleutheria*, a persecuting Empresse. *Vigilius* had no occasion at his comming to excommunicate her, the cause of *Anthimus* was before that ended. *Theodora* and *Vigilius* consented together in one profession of faith: he condemning the *three Chapters*, a little after he came to *Constantinople*, as well as the Empresse, could not condemne or excommunicate her for an heretike, but hee must condemne himselfe also. I, but Pope *Gregory*<sup>e</sup> saith expressly he did excommunicate her. Might I in stead of an answer say as some<sup>f</sup> of their owne Writers do in another cause, *Gregorius hic non est audiendus*, *Gregory is here not to be regarded*: or but say as their owne Bishop *Cannus*<sup>g</sup> doth, that *Gregory* was too credulous in writing reports; the matter were soone answered: But I am not willing to censure *Gregory* so hard as they doe: my answer is, that the name of *Vigilius* is by an error either of the writer or Printer of *Gregory*, inserted there in stead of *Agapetus*: for of *Agapetus*, *Victor*<sup>h</sup> is an expresse witnessse, that he indeed deprived *Theodora* of the communion: All the circumstances accord thereunto. *Theodora* was then an enemy to the Councell of *Chalcedon*, she tooke part, and was a patron of *Anthimus*: *Gregory* himselfe notes this fact to be done equally against the whole sect<sup>i</sup> of the *Acephalian* heretikes, as against *Theodora*: now *Vigilius* had nothing to doe with those heretikes; it was the cause of the *three Chapters* wherewith hee was troubled; the heads of the *Acephali*, *Severus*, *Petrus*, *Zoaras*, and their followers, were condemned both by *Agapetus*<sup>k</sup>, and by the great Councell of *Constantinople*<sup>l</sup> under *Mennas*, where were present the Legates of the *Romane See*, *Agapetus* being lately dead: and the same sentence was confirmed by the Emperour *Iustinian*<sup>m</sup> at the end of the Synod, so that there was nothing left for *Vigilius* to doe against the *Acephali*, who both by the Pontificall, Synodall, and Imperiall sentence were condemned nine years before his comming to *Constantinople*. Lastly, the very scope and coherence of *Gregories* text doth inforce this correction. The defenders of the *three Chapters* alledged, that since the time of the fift Councell, wherein the *three Chapters* were condemned, many calamities had befallen *Italy*, whereupon they concluded that God afflicted the Church for that decree of the fift Councell; and for condemning of those *three Chapters*. *Gregory* to refute this their reason, alledged another example, and of former times: to wit, of condemning the *Acephali*, whom they, to whom *Gregory* writ, acknowledged for heretikes; saying, *Postquam*, after Pope *Agapetus* when he came into this kingly City denounced a sentence of condemnation, against *Theodora*, and the *Acephali*, then was *Rome* besieged, and taken by the enemies

e Greg. lib. 2.

Epist. 36.

f Autor. apol.

Tumultuaria.

pro dispensatione

de matrim. Henr.

8. &amp; uxoris fra-

tris ejus. fol. 46.

g De loc. Theol.

lib. 11. ca. 6. §.

Lex vero 2.

h Agapetus Ar-

chiepiscop. Rom.

Theodoram Au-

gustam Anthimi

patronam commu-

nionis privavit:

Anthimum de-

ponit, &amp; Men-

nam ejus loco

Episcopum ponit.

Vict. Tunun. in

Chron. in Coss.

Iustin. an. 14.

Iustiniani.

i Papa, contra

Theodoram &amp;

Acephalos dam-

nationis senten-

tiam promulga-

vit. Greg. loco

citato.

k Acephalorum

Principes, An-

thimum, Severum,

&amp;c. condemna-

vit Agapetus.

Bin. Not. in vi-

tam Agapet. pa.

416. b.

l Act. 5.

m Const. Justin.

post finem Synod.

sub Menna.

in Totilas Ro-  
mam contendit,  
quam statim ob-  
sedit. Proc. lib. 3.  
de bell. Goth. pa.  
360.

o Vigilium venit  
Constantinopolin.  
an. 12. belli Go-  
thic. Proc. lib.  
eodem. pa. 364.  
Romam obsedit  
Totilas. an. 11.  
eiusdem belli.  
lib. eodem. pa.  
359. & seq.

p Proc. lib. eod. 3.  
an. 14. belli  
Goth. pa. 394.

enemies (that is the Gothes,) was therefore God angry for that sentence against the *Acephali*? Apply this reason to *Vigilius*, and his time, and it is not onely untrue, but unfit to the purpose of *Gregory*: for before *Vigilius* his comming to *Constantinople*, not only *Vitiges* the Goth possessed *Rome*, (from whom *Belisarius* in the time of *Silverius* recovered it) and made great havocke in *Italy*; but *Totilas* also (before *Vitiges* came) besieged it so hard, that by reason of the famine they were driven not onely to eate mice, and dogs, but even dung also, and last of all one to eate up another: and that same yeare *Totilas* tooke *Rome*, sacked it, and had purposed utterly to have abolished it, and burnt it to ashes, but that *Belisarius* by his most prudent and fortunate perswasions, staid him from that barbarous immanity. Now seeing not onely the siege, but captivity of *Rome* was after the comming of that Pope to *Constantinople*, and sentence against *Theodora*, of whom *Gregory* speaketh, it must needs be hee meant Pope *Agapetus*, whose sentence all the foresaid calamities follow; and not *Vigilius*, before whose comming to *Constantinople* *Rome* was besieged by *Totilas*, and taken also before the sentence, if it was (as by *Anastasius* is to be gathered) not denounced till the second yeare after *Vigilius* his comming thither. Neither onely had the reason of *Gregory* beene untrue, but most unfit for his purpose, had he meant *Vigilius* in this place: for hee clearly intends such a calamity as hapned before the condemning of the *three Chapters*, but after the condemning of the *Acephali*. Now it is certaine by the Acts of the fift Councell, and by the Emperours testimony, that as the Easterne Bishops, so also *Vigilius* presently after he came to *Constantinople* consented to condemne the *three Chapters*, yea condemned them by a Pontificall decree and judgement, and continued in that minde till the time of the fift Councell; at which time by the general Synod they were also condemned. *Gregory* then should have spoken against himselfe, had hee meant *Vigilius*, and his comming to *Constantinople*, in saying that after the sentence of *Vigilius* against *Theodora*, the City was besieged and taken, (as it was once againe indeed taken by *Totilas* p in the 23. yeare of *Iustinus*;) for his adversaries to whom he writ, being defenders of the *three Chapters*, would have replied against him, that this calamity befell them from the very same cause; seeing both the Easterne Bishops and the Pope consented in that doctrine of condemning of the *three Chapters*. Thus it appeareth not by surmises and conjectures, but by certaine and evident prooffe, that the text of *Gregory* is corrupted, or else that *Gregory* himselfe was mistaken therein, (which in a matter so neare his dayes wee may not thinke) and so that it was not *Vigilius*, but *Agapetus* whom *Gregory* intended to denounce that sentence against the *Acephali*, or *Theodora*, of which *Baronius* maketh such boast, and commends with such great ostentation, that thereby he might make the Empresse who was a condemner of the *three Chapters*, more odious, and strengthen that fiction and fabulous tale of *Anastasius*, that *Vigilius* contended with *Iustinian* and *Theodora* about *Anthemius*.



CAP. XXII.

How Baronius declameth against the cause it selfe of the Three Chapters, and a refutation thereof.

**B**aronius not content to wrecke his spite upon the Emperour and Emperesse in such unciuill manner as you have seene, carpes in the next place at the very cause it selfe of the three Chapters. What did Vigilius, saith hee<sup>a</sup>, offend, in appointing that men should be silent and say nothing untill the future Synod, of this cause of the three Chapters? which if it could have beene, potius perpetuo erat silentio condemnanda, sapienda, sepelienda, atque penis extinguenda; was rather to be condemned to perpetuall silence, to be buried and utterly extinguished. Again<sup>b</sup>, I doe never feare to avouch that it had beene much better that the Church had remained without these controversies (about the three Chapters) nec unquam de his aliquis habitus esset sermo, and that there had never beene one word spoken of them. Thus Baronius.

<sup>a</sup> Bar. an. 547. nu. 48.

<sup>b</sup> an. 553. n. 237

2. What thinke you moved the Cardinall to have such an immortal hatred to this cause, as to wish the condemning, buriall, and utter extinguishing of those controversies? What more hurt did this to the Church, than the question about *iquin*, about *seruic*, or about the opinion of *Eutiches*? Very great calamity, saith Baronius<sup>c</sup>, insued upon this controversie, both in the East and West. True, it did so; and so there did, and far greater and longer about the controversie of *iquin*; and more againe than that, upon the question whether the Gospell or Paganisme should preuaile: and yet by moving those controversies was the faith propagated; the truth of Christ spread abroad, the blood of Martyrs was made the seed of the Gospell. No affliction, calamity, or persecution, is a just cause either to wish that there had never beene any such controversie; or to forsake the truth of God, when the controversie is moved. It was an excellent saying of the Egyptian Bishops in the Councell of Chalcedon<sup>d</sup>, *Christianus neminem timet, a Christian feareth no mortall man; si homines timerentur, martyres non essent, if men should be feared, there would be no Martyrs*. But the truth is, it was not as Baronius fancieth; the controversie it selfe, nor the disputing and debating thereof, that caused so great calamities in the East and West; that is *non causa pro causa*; the peevishnesse and perversenesse of wicked men maintaining heresies, and oppugning the truth, that was the true cause thereof. The controversie it selfe, if you well marke it, was very beneficiall to the Church. *Oportet hæreses esse*, there must be heresies among you, that they which are approved might be knowne. Every heresie is a probation and tryall of mens love to God, and his truth, whether they esteeme it more than their honours, pleasures, and their owne wilfull conceits; and the greater the heresie is, and the further it spreads, it is still a greater tryall. Heretikes, saith *S. August*, doe much profit the Church, though they be out of the Church; nam

<sup>c</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>d</sup> Act. 1. pa. 3.

<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. 11. 19.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. de verig. relig. ca. 8.

by teaching the truth which they doe not know, but by stirring up those who are more carnall Catholikes, so seeke, and those who are more spirituall, to defend and manifest the truth. This triall and probation of men (if I mistake not) was never so great in any controversie or question, as in this of the three Chapters. First, it sifted and tryed *Vigilius* to the full, and tryed him to be a wether-cocke in faith, an heretike, and a defender of hereses even by his *Apostolicall* authority. Next, it sifted out divers notable conclusions: as first, that which I think was never before that tryed; that not onely the Pope, but the *Apostolike* See also, to wit, the *Romane Church*, and with it the *Western Churches*, all at once adhered to heresie, and forooke the truth, and that even after it was decreed, and judged by the generall approved Councell; and so it proved both Pope and *Romane Church* to be properly hereticall, the *Eastern Churches* constantly upholding the truth at that time; it shewed that the *Catholike* faith was tied neither to the Chair, nor Church of *Rome*. Another conclusion then tryed, was that either persons, or Churches, may not onely dissent from the Pope and the *Romane Church*, and that in a cause of faith judicially defined by the Pope with a Synod, but may renounce communion with them, and yet remaine *Catholikes*, and in the unity of the *Catholike Church*; the Pope, the *Western Church*, and all that adhered unto them being then by forsaking the *Catholike* faith, *Heretikes*, and by forsaking the unity of the Church, *Schismatikes*.

3. Neither onely was this controversie a triall to them in that age; a tryall of their faith, love to God, charity to the Church, obedience to the Emperour, but it is as great a triall even in these our dayes, and ever since that doctrine of the Popes *infallibility* in causes of faith hath beene defined and condemned. By this controversie, most happily decided by the generall Councell, all that hold the Popes definitions of faith to be *infallible*, that is, all that are *Papists*, or members of the present Church of *Rome*, they are all hereby tryed to defend this *Apostolicall Constitution* of *Vigilius*, that is, to maintaine all the blasphemies of the *Nestorians*, to deny the *Catholike* faith, the doctrine of the *Apostles*, of the *primative Church*, of the *fift generall Councell*; & so to be not only *heretikes*, but convicted, *anathematized*, and condemned *heretikes*, by the judgement of a generall approved Councell, and so by the consenting judgement of the *Catholike Church*. Further yet there is a tryall of them, whether upon that ground or foundation of the Popes *infallibility*, they will build up and maintaine any other doctrine, or position of faith, or religion; if they doe (as indeed every point of the *Romish* faith and Religion relyeth upon that) they are againe hereby tryed to be hereticall, not onely in the foundation, but in every position and doctrine of their faith and religion, which relies upon that foundation.

4. This was it which netled *Baronius*, and extorted from him those earnest and affectionate wishes, that this controversie had never beene heard of, nor mentioned in the world: he saw what a tryall was like to be made by it of men, of doctrines, of Churches, of the Pope himselfe, and their whole *Romish Church*; and seeing that tryall, he never


*Infallible by the  
of Pope & the  
of the  
antichristian  
Gerasius.*

ver ceased to say, that it had beene much better that this controversie had never beene moved, nor spoken of; for so they had avoided this most notable triall. Blessed be God, for that it pleased him in the infinite depth of his unspeakable wisdom to cause this controversie to be ventilated; and discussed to the utmost; that among many other tryals, this might be one of the Antichristian Synagogue, to try them even untill the very destruction of Antichrist. It is for heretikes whose errors and obstinacy is tryed, and discovered to the world; it is for them, I say, to wish that the controversies about Arianisme, Nestorianisme, Eutycheanisme, and the like, had never beene moved; they had scaped the just censures and anathemaes by that meanes. But Catholikes have cause to rejoyce and triumph in such controversies, by which, both the truth which they maintaine, is made more resplendent and victorious, themselves; and their faith tryed to be like refined gold, the Church thereby is quieted, the truth propagated, heresies confounded, and the glory of Almighty God, much more magnified, and prayed.

a An. 534. nu. 22  
b An. 546. nu. 9.  
c Ibid. nu. 8.  
d Edevo sanctiss.  
nes sibi arrogat  
(Iustin.) quas  
doloſe conſcrip-  
ſiſſent heretici.  
an. 546. nu. 41.  
Egerunt callide  
adverſarii vari-  
tatis, &c. ibid.  
nu. 9.

CAP. XXIII.

How Baronius revileth both the Imperiall Edict of Iustinian; and Theodorus B. of Cæsarea; and a refutation of the same.

i.  Eeing now, notwithstanding the wishing of Baronius, this controversie could not be buried, (it ought him and all ill-willers of it a greater shame than that) in the next place let us see how he declameth both against the Emperours Edict, whereby these three Chapters were condemned, & Theodorus Biſh. of Cæsarea, who (as he saith) was the author & penner of that Edict. The Edict it selfe he calleth first, *Seminarium* a *diffentionis*, a seed-plot of sedition, which was never made up on a good occasion, nor had any good end. And not content herewith, he tells us out of *Facundus*, that it is contrary to the faith, yea even to that faith which Iustinian himselfe professed as orthodoxall; to which effect also Baronius himselfe saith <sup>c</sup> that the Emperours Edict was set forth contrary to the three Chapters of the most holy Councell of Chalcedon. But he specially seekes to disgrace it by the author of it, for though it was published by Iustinian, yet saith he <sup>d</sup>, it was written, and that craftily by heretikes and adversaries to the truth; by the <sup>e</sup> Origenists, and in particular by <sup>f</sup> Theodorus Bishop of Cæsarea, one gracious, potent, and familiar with the Emperour: and for prooffe of all this the Cardinall citeth *Liberatus* <sup>h</sup>, *Facundus*, and *Vigilius*.

2. Having thus declared Theodorus to be the author and writer of the Edict; Baronius then rageth against Theodorus, as if he were to act veterē comœdiam, or according to the Proverbe, *ex planstro*, to raile out of a cart against him, calling him *factious* <sup>i</sup>, *fraudulent* <sup>k</sup>, *impudent* <sup>l</sup>, a most wicked <sup>m</sup>, hereticall, schismaticall, headstrong Origenist, the ring-leader of the

e Ingrue pro-  
fessus est, Orige-  
nistarum studiis  
ea fuisse ab Im-  
peratore promul-  
gata, ibid. nu. 49.  
f Illud à Theo-  
doro conſcriptū  
editū ſuo no-  
mine Iuſtin. pro-  
mulgavit. ibid.  
nu. 8.  
g an. 538. nu. 85  
h an. 546. nu. 9.  
i an. 534. nu.  
21. & alibi.  
i Iuſtin. ſaſcioſo-  
rum ſtudijs ſe  
inſeruit. an. 550.  
nu. 14.  
k Hominem va-  
ſtrum. an. 551.  
nu. 4. & 564.  
nu. 7.  
l Ejus gratia  
ſaſcius impudens  
ibid. nu. 3.  
m Theodorum  
idum nequiſſi-  
mum quem  
vitium in  
modum ſaviſſe  
oſendimus Ori-  
geniſi bareſim.  
an. 564. nu. 6.  
& occultum ha-  
reticum, mani-  
feſtum ſchiſma-  
ticum. an. 551.  
nu. 5. Præcep-  
tū Origeniſa. an.  
eod. nu. 41.



n Non Origenis  
tantum errorum  
affecta, sed &  
Eusebiana  
blasphemica ve-  
bementissimum  
propugnator. an.  
564. nu. 7.  
o Ita miser (Iu-  
stinianus) cecus  
caecum (Theodo-  
rum) secutus, cū  
ipso pariter mer-  
gatur in profun-  
dum. an. 564.  
nu. 7. agit autē  
de heresi Apha-  
thardochitarum,  
p. 119, sacrilegum  
(Theodorum)  
pseudoeπισcopum,  
immo tyrannum  
insurgit, in per-  
versorem legum,  
eversorem iuris.  
an. 551. nu. 5.  
q. Qui Impera-  
tori omnium illi  
malorum causa  
fuit. an. 551. n. 3.  
r. Hic igitur no-  
vandissimus, so-  
litas Ecclesie  
pestis. an. 564.  
nu. 7.

the Origenists, one marvellously addicted to the heresie of Origen: nor onely a servant to Origen's errors, but also a most earnest defender of the Eusebeian blasphemy; nor onely so, but plunged in the heresie of the Aphthardokites, or Phantasticks, and like a blinde guide leading the blinde Emperour into that ditch of heresie: a sacrilegious person, a pseudobishop, a tyrant, a perverter of lawes, an overthrower of right, the author of all mischiefe to the Empire, the very plague of the whole Church: Thus and much more doth Baronius utter against Theodorus, by whom being so unworthy an author, hee would disgrace the Ediēt it selfe, which he writ, though the Emperour published it.

3. Let us first begin with that most untrue and malicious calumny of Baronius, that the Emperour published his Ediēt against the three Chapters of the Councell of Chalcedon. Truly the Cardinall should and might most truly have said the quite contrary, that he published his Ediēt for defence not onely of the three, but of every Chapter, of every position, of every decree of the Councell of Chalcedon. The three Chapters which that Imperiall Ediēt, and after it the fift Councell, and the whole Catholike Church condemneth, were not Chapters of the Councell of Chalcedon, but three impious positions, assertions, or (as they were by an equivalent word called) Chapters, which heretikes, specially the Nestorians, collected, and falsely boasted to bee taught by the Councell of Chalcedon; whereas in very truth the holding of any one of them (much more of them all) is the overthrow of the whole Councell at Chalcedon, yea of the whole Catholike faith: that Councell contradicteth and condemneth them all, no lesse than the fift Councell, which as Gregory truly saith, is in omnibus sequax, it doth in every point follow and consent unto the Councell of Chalcedon. The like may be said of that which out of Facundus, Baronius observeth, and citeth as a prooffe of his saying, that the Emperours Ediēt is repugnant and contrary to the orthodoxall faith. Baronius will still keepe his old wont in applauding Vigilinus and the defenders of the Three Chapters. For if the Ediēt condemning them be contrary, then is the defence of them consonant to the faith, and then not the Imperiall Ediēt of Iustinian, but the Pontificall Constitution of Vigilinus must be approved as orthodoxall. And what is this else, but to condemne the judgement of the fift generall Councell, of Pope Pelagius, Gregory, and all Popes after them, of all generall Councells following it; in a word, to contradict, and utterly condemne the consenting judgement of the whole Church, for the space of 11. hundred yeares: they all approve the determination of the fift Councell, and it so fully consenteth with the Ediēt in condemning the Three Chapters, that in their definitive sentence they differ very little in words, but in substance and sense nothing at all from the Emperours Ediēt, which caused Binius to say, the Ediēt of the Emperour was approved by the Pope and the Councell: So Catholike and orthodoxall is it, so advisedly and orthodoxally penned. To seeke no further prooffe, Baronius himselfe was so insatuated in this cause, that he oftentimes confuteth his owne sayings: for himselfe gives a most ample and most observable testimony of this Ediēt, and of the orthodoxy thereof, saying of it, Est ve-

luti Catechismus, & fidei Catholica exacta declaratio; this Edict of Iustinian is as it were a Catechisme, or an exact declaration of the Catholike faith, and an exact discussing of the Three Chapters, which were afterwards long controverted in the Church. So untrue is that his first calumnie against the Edict, whereby hee would perswade, that it is contrary to certaine Chapters of the holy Councell of Chalcedon, or as Facundus plainly; but most untrueely affirmeth; contrary to the Catholike faith.

4. For the second calumnie, that his Edict was a seminary of sedition, Baronius might as justly condemne the decree of Nice, of Ephesus, of Chalcedon, yea, the very Scripture it selfe, and preaching of the Gospell; Christ himselfe is set as *signum contradictionis*, as a butt of contradiction, against which they will ever bee striving, and shooting their arrowes of opposition, sedition, & contention: himselfe saith, *I am come to set fire on the earth, and what would I but that it should be kindled*: and againe, *Suppose yee that I am come to give peace on the earth, I tell you nay, but rather division*; and no sooner was the Gospell preached abroad in the world, but that which our Saviour foretold them, came to passe; *Brother shall deliver up brother, the father the Childe; the Children shall rise against their Parents, and cause them to be put to death; and ye shall be hated of all men for my names sake*: what a seminary of sedition may the Cardinal call the Gospell, that caused all these troubles, warres, seditions, murders, and burnings in the whole world? what another Seminary was the Nicene decree against Arianisme, and Constantines Edict to ratifie the same? after that, how seditionously was Athanasius and the Catholikes persecuted, put to flight, to torments, by Constantine and the Arians? how seditionously did the Councils of Ariminum, and Syrmium oppugne and fight against that Nicene Decree, till they had so farre prevailed, that well-neare there had needed no longer contending, the whole world almost being turned Arians, and even groaning under Arianisme? If the Cardinal; by reason of those manifold troubles and oppositions, which ensued upon this Edict, will condemne it for being a Seminary of sedition; let him first condemne the Nicene Decree, and Imperiall Edict for it; let him condemne the Gospell, and Christ himselfe, which were all such Seminaries as that Edict was. If notwithstanding all the oppositions, seditions, & contentions raysed by heathen, heretical, & other wicked men, against these, they were (as most certainly they were) Seminaries of truth; let the Card. know & acknowledge his malicious slander against this most religious and orthodox all Edict of Iustinian, which was, as all the former, a sacred Sanctuary for the Catholike faith. Seditions, oppositions, tumults, persecutions, and the like disturbances in the Church, spring not from Christ, nor from his Word and Gospell, either preached by Bishops, or decreed by Councils, or confirmed by Imperiall Edicts, all these are of themselves causes onely of unity, concord, peace, and agreement in the Church; these onely are the proper, native, and naturall fruits, and effects that proceed from them; but contentions and seditions come from the perverse, froward, wicked, and malicious mindes of men, that hate the truth, and in hatred

of it fight against all that uphold the truth, bee it by preaching, by decreeing, or by enacting the truth, these are as Wolves, which by continuall tumbling in the mire disturbe and trouble the streame: The fountaines whence the truth springeth are most pure and most peaceable.

5. Now whereas in the third place *Baronius* seekes to disgrace the *Edict*, by the Author of it, whom he describes to have beene not onely an heretike, but a most detestable person, even the plague of the whole Church, let us suppose and admit the Author to have beene such a man indeed, nay, to have beene *Iudas* himselfe, (and worse than *Iudas* hee could hardly bee, seeing CHRIST himselfe called *Iudas* a Devill,) Is the *Edict*, or the truth of God thereby published, worse, because *Iudas* uttered or penned it? was the Arke to bee refused or contemned, because wicked men framed and built it? Did not Christ say <sup>2</sup> of *Iudas*, (a Devill) as well as of *Peter* a Saint, *He that heareth you heareth mee, he that despiseth you despiseth me*? Hath *Baronius* forgotten the lesson of Saint *James* <sup>2</sup>, *My brethren, have not the faith of our glorious Lord Iesus Christ in respect of persons; love it for it selfe, but neither love it nor refuse it because of him that speaketh, penneth, or bringeth the same*? Did the Cardinall never heare of the Scribes and Pharisees, *they sit <sup>b</sup> in Moses chaire*, (that is, deliver Gods truth out of *Moses* and the Prophets unto you) *whatsoever therefore they bid you, that observe, doe, but after their workes doe not*? Or if this reason of the Cardinall may take effect, themselves, and their Romane Church will be farre the greatest loosers, how easie will it be to reject and contemne an whole Volume of their Pontificall Edicts? why, this was made or written by *John* 12. that by *Hildebrand*, or *Boniface* 8. the other by *Iohn* 23. an heretike, an Atheist, a Devill incarnate, as a generall Councell <sup>c</sup> testifieth; another by *Formosus*, *Steven*, or by one of those whom themselves professe to have beene theeves, robbers, Wolves, Tygers, and most savage beasts, and Apostaticall Popes, as *Genebrard* <sup>d</sup> calleth threescore of them, all worse than the Author of this Imperiall *Edict*, though wee should admit him to have beene such, or as bad every way as *Baronius* describeth him.

<sup>c</sup> *Johannes* 23.  
inter Christi  
fideles vitas ac  
mores ejus cog-  
noscentes, vulga-  
riter dicitur Di-  
abolus incarna-  
tus, Conc. Con-  
stant. sess. 11.

<sup>d</sup> *Per annos fere*  
*150. Pontifices*  
*fere 50. à virtu-*  
*te majorum*  
*prorsus defec-*  
*vunt, Apostolici,*  
*Apostatice,*  
*potius quam A-*  
*postolici, &c.*  
*Gen. lib. 4. Chro-*  
*nol. ad an. 904.*

6. But the truth is, the Author of the *Edict* was no such man as the Cardinall fancieth: as it beares the name, so it was indeed the worke of *Iustinian*, no childe can have more honour by his father, than it by such an Emperour: and though *Baronius* having so often slandered *Iustinian*, to bee utterly rude, unlearned, one that could not so much as reade, nor knew his Alphabet or first elements, could not but in good congruity confidently deny *Iustinian* to bee the Writer, or Author of so learned and divine an *Edict*, or as himselfe calls it, of so exact a Catechisme, yet considering what before was declared, both out of *Procopius* of the Emperours often tossing of bookes among the Bishops, out of *Liberatus* of his great paines taken in writing against heretikes, and for defence of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and out of *Platina* calling *Iustinian* a very learned Emperour: I cannot thinke but that although *Iustinian* might use the advise, helpe, and industry of

*Mennas,*



*Mennas, Theodorus*, or some other Bishops in this as in other *Edicts*, concerning Ecclesiasticall affaires, yet still the *ultima manus*, the last correction and perfecting of all, was the Emperours owne doing, the rather because both in his other *Edicts*, that against *Anthimus*, against *Origen*, as also in his letters to this Synod, and the rest, there is so uniforme a stile, so Imperiall, and so divine a kinde of writing, that the same Genius of *Iustinian* seemes to breathe in them all.

7. But *Baronius* <sup>e</sup> tels us, that both *Liberatus*, *Facundus*, and *Vigilius* doe testifie *Theodorus* Bishop of *Cesarea* to bee the Author of this *Edict*. *Baronius* is ever like himselfe, that is, untrue, and fraudulent: Not one of these say it: first, not *Liberatus*, hee indeed affirmes <sup>f</sup> *Theodorus* and some others to have suggested this unto the Emperour, that hee would condemne those Three Chapters, by a publike *Edict* or booke; but hee addes withall, *Rogaverunt cum ut diceret Libellum*, they prayed the Emperour that he would dictate or indite the booke against the Three Chapters; and the Emperour consented, saith *Liberatus* <sup>g</sup>, unto them, *& hoc se latius implere promissit*, and he gladly promised to doe so, that is, to indite or dictate such an *Edict*. So farre is *Liberatus* from affirming, as *Baronius* alleagerh him, *Theodorus* to bee the Author of this booke or *Edict*, that hee teacheth the quite contrary. As for *Facundus* he <sup>h</sup> saith indeed, the *Edict* was not written by *Iustinian*, but by the adversaries of the truth: but that *Theodorus* writ it, that is the Cardinals addition, *Facundus* saith it not: and even in that which hee saith, that the *Edict* is contrary to the Emperours faith, *Facundus* doth so manifestly slander, both the Emperour, (as if hee thought the Three Chapters were not to be condemned,) and the *Edict* also, as if the condemning of these Three Chapters were contrary to the Catholike faith) that there is no credit at all to bee given to him in his report touching the Author, who is so untrue in his reports, both touching the matter of the *Edict*, and touching the knowne profession, and faith of the Emperour.

8. The Cardinals *Vigilius* now remaineth, whose words <sup>i</sup> are these spoken to *Theodorus*; The booke condemning the Three Chapters, by their meanes was read in the Kings Pallace, before certaine Greeke Bishops, *à quibus assentionum favorem tuis vocibus exigebas*: What if one should here oppose the Cardinall, and say, *tuis vocibus*, were the Ablative case, and that *Theodorus* had by his words sollicited, the other Bishops favorably to consent to the Emperours *Edict*? How will *Baronius* assure us, that they must bee taken in the Dative case; as if *Theodorus* had sollicited them to consent to his words, that is, as the Cardinall supposeth, to the *Edict* which was penned, and written by him, or whereof he was the Author? Sure against this Baronian construction, the words of *Liberatus* are very pregnant, seeing *Theodorus*, as hee sheweth, was one who entreated the Emperour to indite or dictate the booke, and the Emperour promised so to doe. If then *Theodorus* sollicited the Bishops to consent to the words of the *Edict*, hee certainly urged them (by this testimonie of *Liberatus*) to consent not to his owne, but to the Emperours words, of whose inditing and dictating

c An. 546. nu. 8  
9.

f In suo Brevi-  
ar. ca. 24.

g Annuit ei  
Princeps Joid.

h Ea qua scribi  
fecerunt, titulo  
nominis tui pra-  
notarunt, verum  
nos illa scripta  
nolumus tua di-  
ci, Fac. apud  
Bar. an. 546. nu.  
9.

i Inter Epist. Vi-  
giliy, Epist. 17.  
tom. 2. Conc. p. 6.  
503. b.

dictating the *Edit* was. Admit them to bee the Dative, how knowes the Cardinall, that by [*tuus vocibus*] are ment the words of the *Edit*? might not *Theodorus* signifie to the Bishops his owne great liking of the Emperours *Edit*, and perswade them to the like, to say as he said, to consent to his words in approving the *Imperiall Edit*? The Card. was too secure & negligēt in relying on these words [*tuus vocibus*] which being so ambiguous, receive divers, & those also just exceptions: But yet there is a farre worfe fault in this prooffe; that the Epistle, whence the Cardinall citeth these words, though it beare the name of *Vigilius*, yet is intruth not the Epistle of *Vigilius*, but a very counterfeit and base forgery under his name, full of untruths, unworthy of any credit at all, which, besides other proofes, (hereafter to be alleaged) faineth *Mennas* to be Bishop of *Constantinople*, and to be excommunicated, together with *Theodorus*, by *Vigilius* foure or five yeares after hee was dead, which censure was to stand in force till *Mennas* repented of his contumacie against the Popes Decree, and should be reconciled to him. This lying and base forgery doth *Baronius* bring to prove *Theodorus*, and not *Iustinian* to bee the author of this *Imperiall Edit*. Might not one say here as was said of the Ass, Like lips, like lettuce? Such a writing is a most fit witness for *Baronius*, who delighteth in untruths, and not finding true records, to give testimony to them, it was fit hee should applaud the most vile and abject forgeries, if they seeme to speak ought pleasing to the Cardinals pallate, or which may serve to support his untruths.

9. You see that yet it appeares not that *Theodorus* was the writer or penner of this Decree, none of *Baronius* his witnesses affirming it, and *Liberatus*, who is the best of them all, affirming the contrary. I might now with this answer put off a great part of those reviling speeches which *Baronius* so prodigally bestoweth on *Theodorus*: But I minde not so to leave the Cardinall, nor suffer the proud Philistine so insolently to revile and insult over any one of the Israelites; much lesse this worthy Bishop of *Cesarea*, to whom hee could not have done a greater honor, than in that which he intended as an exceeding disgrace to him, to call and account him the Author and Writer of this *Edit*. It is no small honour, that *Iustinian*, so wise and religious an Emperour, should commit the care of so waighty a matter to *Theodorus*; that hee should have him in so high esteeme, as account his word an Oracle, to bee guided and directed by his judgement; so to adhere unto him, as *Constantine* did to that renowned *Hosius*, as to thinke it a *piaculum*, or great offence not to follow his advice in matters of so great waight, consequence, and importance. Nay, this one *Edit*, (supposing with the Cardinall *Theodorus* to bee the Author of it) shall not onely pleade for *Theodorus*, but utterly wipe away all those vile slanders of heresie, impiety, imprudency, and the like, so often, and so odiously objected, and exaggerated by the Cardinall against him; this writing and the words thereof being (as whosoever readeth them will easily conceive, and if hee deale ingenuously, confesse) the words of truth, of faith, of sobriety, of profound knowledge, evidences of a minde full fraught with faith, with piety, with the love

of God, and Gods Church, and in a word full of the holy Ghost. As *Sophocles*<sup>k</sup>, being accused to doate, recited his *Oedipus Coloneus*, and demanding whether that did seeme the Poeme of a doating man, was by the sentence of all the Iudges acquitted: So none can reade this *Edict*, but forthwith acknowledge it a meere calumny in *Baronius* to call the maker of it an heretike, whose profession of faith is so pious, divine, and Catholike. Or rather *Theodorus* may answer that *Baronian* slander with the like words, as did *S. Paul*<sup>l</sup>, *They neither found me making an uproare among the people, nor in the Synagogues, nor in the City, neither can they prove these things whereof they now accuse mee*; but this I confesse, that after this way, (declared in this *Edict*) which they call heresie, so worship I the God of my fathers.

<sup>k</sup> Cic. de Senect.

<sup>l</sup> Act. 24. 12. 13

10. Now as this may serve for a generall Antidote at once, as it were, to expell all the whole poyson of those *Baronian* calumnies; so, if we shall descend to particulars, the innocency of *Theodorus*, as also the malice and malignity of *Baronius* will much more clearly appeare. The crimes objected to *Theodorus* by *Baronius* are reduced to three heads; one, his threefold heresie; another, his opposing himselfe to Pope *Vigilius*, or the Decree of Taciturnity, in the cause of the *Three Chapters*; the third, his misleading of *Iustinian* into the heresie of the *Aphardokites*, and so causing that great persecution of the Church which thereupon ensued; all the other disgracefull termes are but the superfluity of that malice which the Cardinall beares against all that were opposit to *Vigilius*, and his *Apostolicall* Constitution: To begin then with that which is easiest, the two last crimes are not so easily uttered as refuted, they both are nothing else but meere slanders and calumnies, without any certaine ground, or probability of truth, devised either by *Baronius* himselfe, or by such as he is, enemies and haters of the truth; and truly for the later, his misleading *Iustinian* into the heresie of the *Aphardokites*, that is not onely a manifest unruth, (for *Iustinian*, as wee have before<sup>m</sup> proved, did not onely at all hold that heresie) but it is wholly forged and devised by *Baronius*, he hath not any one Author, no not so much as a forged writing to testifie this, no nor any probable collection out of any Author to induce him to lay this imputation upon *Theodorus*; the world is wholly and soly beholden to the Cardinall for this shamelesse calumny, and yet see the wisdom of *Baronius* herein, hee was not content barely and in a word to taxe and reprove *Theodorus*, (which had bene more than sufficient, having no prooffe nor evidence of the crime) but in this passage, as if hee had demonstratively proved *Theodorus* to bee guilty hereof, hee rageth and foameth like a wilde Bore against him, calling him a most wicked man, and most vehement propugner of blasphemy, the plague of the whole Church, who with a viol affrayed the Emperour like a little Boy from the truth, and led him captive into heresie. Doe you not thinke that the Cardinall needed to be sent to *Anticyra*, when he writ this not onely without truth, but without braine and ordinary sense?

<sup>m</sup> Ca. 20.

11. The other crime, that *Theodorus* opposed himselfe to *Vigilius*, and to the decree of silence, is like the former, save that this difference



rence is to be observed betwixt them, that the former was forged by *Baronius*, but this later is grounded on a foolish and forged writing applauded by *Baronius*, fictions and forgeries they are both, but the one was fained to the Cardinals hand, for the other hee was faine to beate it out of his owne anwill. There was neither any such decree for taciturnity, neither did *Theodorus*, nor needed hee to oppose himselfe to *Vigilius*, for *Vigilius*, as well as *Theodorus*, all the whole time almost from his comming to *Constantinople* till the fift Councell was assembled, wholly consented to condemne the *Three Chapters*, as, besides other evident proofes before alleaged, to which I remit the reader, that one testimony of the Emperour doth undeniably demonstrate; *Quod vero ejusdem voluntatis semper fuit de condemnatione Trium Capitulorum per plurima declaravit; Vigilus hath by very many things declared, that he hath been alwayes (since his comming to Constantinople) of the same minde in condemning the Three Chapters; what thinke you here againe of Baronius, who upon this occasion of contradicting Vigilus, & his decree of silence, reviles Theodorus, calling him sacrilegiom, a Pseudo-Bishop, a tyrant, a schismaticke, a perverter of lawes, the author of all evils; and yet when the Cardinall hath said all this, there is no truth nor reality in the cause and occasion for which hee thus rageth and revileth; no opposition to Vigilus, no decree of silence either oppugned, or such as might bee oppugned, it was a non ens, a chymera floating in the Cardinals idle fancy. Was there no Hellebortis at Rome or in Italy to purge the Cardinals braine of this extreme distemper?*

12. The whole hope consists now in the Cardinals *Triarij*, the three heresies objected to *Theodorus*, that of *Origen*, of *Eutyches*, and of the *Aphthardokites*. And for the two last I must say the same almost as to the former calumnies, they are meere fictions of *Baronius*: *Theodorus* was (saith hee) an *Aphthardokite*, and an *Eutychian* heretike: what Author, what witness or testimony doth the Cardinall produce to prove so hainous a crime against him? truly not one, himselfe accuser simul & testis, is both the accuser and the witness. But yet hee proves it by some good consequence or reason? no nor that neither, his prooffe is no lesse foolish than his position is false. *Iustinian*, saith he, was misled into the heresie of the *Aphthardokites* by some *Origenists*, as *Eustathius* declareth; whereupon we may easily, and without calumny affirme, that the ring-leader of those who misled the Emperour was *Theodorus* Bishop of *Casarea*, an *Origenist*: The ground of w<sup>ch</sup>, (to omit that this *Eustathius* is of no credit) being the heresie of *Iustinian*, seeing that to bee a calumnie and slander wee have before confirmed, this whole collection must needs be like the foundation on which it relyeth, slanderous, and false, to say nothing how alogically and incoherent a consequent this is from particulars. Some *Origenists* misled *Iustinian*, therefore *Theodorus*; how much rather on the contrary may wee certainly conclude, that seeing *Iustinian*, who was directed in causes of faith by *Theodorus*, continued orthodoxall, and a most worthy defender of the true faith, as before we proved, therefore doubtlesse *Theodorus* himselfe, the director of the Emperour, was, and remained orthodoxall;

in Epist. Iustin.  
ad Conc. 5. A.D. 1  
p. 520. a.

o Locis supra citatis.

p Iustinianus obligatus fuit in eo errore (Apib. de bitarum) ab eis, qui ei assistebant, heresis ejus describimus. At quinam illi? Morum Antiochianus fuit Theodorus ille nequissimus, &c. erat is Eutychianus blasphemus propugnator. Bar. an. 564. nu. 6. & 7. q. Ibid. i Sup. ca. 20.

donall; and that of a certaine hee was no Eutychean nor Aphthardo. It is evident by his subscribing to the decree of the fift Councell, wherein not onely the Councell, and decree of Chalcedon condemning Eutyche, and in it the heresie of the Aphthardokites, is strongly confirmed, but Eutyche also by name, and all that hold his heresies, are anathematized, by all the Bishops of that fift Councell; and particularly by this Theodorus, whom the Cardinall; without any testimony or prooffe at all; slanders to have beene an Eutychean and Aphthardokite, unto both which heresies he was most opposite: All which will be more manifest by considering the first of those three heresies, wherein Baronius hath the greatest colour for his saying That Theodorus was an Origenist, and a most earnest maintainer of that heresie, the Cardinall often, and most confidently affirmeth; wherein hee hath Liberatus the Deacon; and Bishop Facundus for his Authors.

Coll. 8.

2 An. 538. m. 39  
u An. 546. 89.  
49.

First for Facundus, he doth not expressly mention Theodorus as an Origenist; but yet because Baronius citeth him to say, that Theodorus writ the *Edit*, and Facundus calleth the writers of that *Edit*, Origenists, let him be admitted for one of the Cardinals witnesses. Who I pray you, or of what credit thinke you is this Bishop Facundus? Truly an enemy to Iustinian, an enemy to Theodorus of Casarea, and to all that condemned the *Three Chapters*, a very heretike, and enemy to the Catholike truth. Witnesse hereof that testimony which their owne Possvine<sup>a</sup> giveth of him out of Isidorus. He writ twelve bookes in defence of the *three Chapters*; whereby he proveth the condemning of those *three Chapters* to bee the condemning or banishing of the Apostolike faith, and the Councell of Chalcedon. Now the defenders of the *three Chapters*; and writers in defence of them to bee condemned, anathematized, and accursed for heretikes by the fift Councell, and after it the 6. 7. and in a word, by all; both generall Councils, and Popes that follow Gregory; we have often before declared: So that by the consenting judgement of all those generall approved Councils, and Popes, Facundus being an earnest defender of them, and writer in their defence, is anathematized, and condemned for an heretike. And that he continued pertinaciously in this heresie, after the sentence and judgement of the generall Councell, Baronius doth witnesse, who tells us, and that with a *Constat*, It is certaine and manifest, that Facundus was sought for to be punished, because hee had written most eloquently in defence of the *three Chapters*, but by lurking in some secret place he escaped. Possvine<sup>a</sup> further addeth, that Facundus writ a booke against Mutianus in defence of Theodorus of Mopsvestia, and that Theodorus of Mopsvestia, damnatus fuit ab Ecclesia Catholica ob errores contra fidem, was condemned by the Catholike Church, for his heresie or errors against the faith. Must not he needs bee an heretike, that defends a condemned heretike? yea defends those very writings and errors of him and Ibas, which are condemned for hereticall? I confesse, saith Facundus<sup>b</sup>, to your Holiness, that I withdraw my selfe from the communion of the opposites, (those were the condemners of the *three Chapters*, that is, to say in truth, Catholikes) not because they condemne Theodorus of Mopsvestia; but for that

2 Poss. Appar.  
in verbo Facundus, et verbo Sc.  
cundus.

7 An. 553. nu.  
221.

a In Facundo,

b Fac. apud Bar.  
an. 547. nu. 38.

in the person of this Theodorus they condemne the Epistle of Ibas as hereticall, and by that Epistle condemne the Councell of Chalcedon, a *qua suscipia est* by which that Epistle is approved. Thus Facundus, so very heretically, than Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus, nor any condemned heretike could wish or say more than Facundus hath done both for their heresies, & against the Councell of Chalcedon. For the impious Epistle of Ibas is wholly hereticall, the approving of it is the overthrow of the whole Catholike faith: and yet Facundus not onely himselfe defendeth that impious Epistle as orthodoxall, and by it defendeth the person and writing of Theodorus of Mopsuestia a condemned heretike; but avoucheth the Councell of Chalcedon to approve the same, which condemnes it and every part of it even to the lowest pit of hell.

14: Here by the way I must in a word put the reader in minde of one or two points which concern Possessive and Baronius in this passage. If Facundus be a condemned heretike for writing in defence of the three Chapters, what else can Possessive be who praysed those bookes of a condemned heretike? for thus he writeth, *Facundus writ opus grande atque elegans, a great and elegant worke*, containing twelve bookes, fortified by the authorities of the Fathers in defence of the three Chapters. Heretike! Is that a brave and elegant booke that defendeth heresie? can heresie be fortified by the testimonies of the holy Fathers? What is this else but to make the holy Fathers heretikes? So hereticall and spitefull is Possessive; that together with himselfe he would draw the ancient and holy Fathers into one and the same crime of heresie. The other point concernes Baronius: hee sayth<sup>d</sup> that the controversie or contention about the three Chapters, was *inter Catholicos tantum, only among such as were Catholikes*: doth not he plainly thereby signifie his opinion of Facundus, that he was a Catholike? for Facundus was as hot, and earnest a cotender in that controversie as Vigilium himselfe, he writ in defence of the three Chapters twelve whole bookes, elegant and brave bookes, as Possessive saith: he bitterly inveighed against the Emperour, against all the condemners of them, against Pope Vigilium himselfe, when hee after his comming to Constantinople consented to the Emperour. Seeing this Facundus (a convicted and condemned heretike) is one of the Cardinals Catholikes, must not heresie and Nestorianisme bee with him Catholike doctrine? must not the impious Epistle be orthodoxall, and the overthrow of the faith and decree of the Councell at Chalcedon bee an Article of Baronius faith? even that which he accounted the Catholike faith? But this by the way. We see now what manner of Bishop Facundus was, an obstinate heretike, pertinaciously persisting in heresie. What though Facundus call Theodorus of Casarea an Origenist? Did not the old Nestorians call Cyril, and other Catholikes, Apollinarians? of whom it seemes the defenders of the three Chapters learned to calumniate the Catholikes with the names of heretikes and Origenists, when they were in truth wholly opposite to those and other heresies. Can any expect a true testimony concerning Theodorus Bishop of Casarea, from Facundus, concerning Catholikes, from heretikes, their immortall and malicious enemies, nor theirs onely, but enemies to the truth? Such, and of such

small



small worth is the former witnes of *Baronius* in this cause, and against *Theodorus*.

15. His other witnesse is *Liberatus* the Deacon, who indeed sayth as plainly as *Baronius* that *Theodorus* was an Origenist; and refers the occasion of that whole controversie touching the three Chapters to the malice of the same *Theodorus*. For as *Liberatus* saith, *Pelagius* the Popes Legate when he was at *Constantinople*, entreated of the Emperour that *Origen*, and his heresies wherewith the Easterne Churches, specially about *Ierusalem*, were exceedingly troubled, might be condemned; whereunto the Emperour willingly assenting, published an Imperiall Ediēt both against him and his errors: when *Theodorus* being an Origenist perceived that *Origen* who was long before dead was now condemned, he to be quit with *Pelagius* for procuring the condemnation of *Origen*, moved the Emperour also to condemne *Theodorus* Bishop of *Mopsuestia*, who had written much against *Origen*, whose writings were detested of all the Origenists: the Emperour at *Theodorus* his suggestion made another Ediēt, wherein he condemned *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, and the two other Chapters touching the writings of *Theodoret* and *Ibas*, which bred so long trouble in the Church. Thus *Liberatus*. Who as you see speaketh as much, and as eagerly against *Theodorus*, as *Baronius* could wish, and *Liberatus* lived and writ about that same time.

16. *Liberatus* in many things is to be allowed, in those especially wherein by partiality his judgement was not corrupt. But in this cause of the Three Chapters, in the occasion and circumstances thereof, hee is a most unfit witnesse, himselfe was deeply interessed in this cause, partiality blinded him, his stile was sharpe against the adverse part, but dull intaxing any, though never so great a crime, in men of his owne faction. Of him *Binius*<sup>f</sup> gives this true censure, hee was one of their ranke who defended the Three Chapters, who also writ an Apology for *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*: againe, *Baronius* and *Bellarmino* have noted<sup>g</sup>, that divers things are *cautè legenda* in *Liberatus*; of him *Possesine*<sup>h</sup> writeth, There are many things in *Liberatus* which are to be read with circumspection, those especially which hee borrowed of some Nestorians, and those are his narrations touching *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, that his writings were praised both by the Emperour *Theodosius* his Ediēt, and by *Cyrill*, and approved also in the Councell of *Chalcedon*; all which to be lies *Baronius* doth convince. Againe<sup>i</sup>, what *Liberatus* saith of the fift Councell is very warily to be read, for either they were not his own, or he was deceived by the false relation of some other, but certainly they do not agree with the writings of other Catholike fathers. Thus *Possesine* out of *Baronius*; who might as well in plaine termes have called *Liberatus* a Nestorian heretike, for none but Nestorians, and such as slander the Council of *Chalcedon* for hereticall, can judge the writings of *Theodorus*, which are full of all heresies, blasphemies, and impieties, to be approved in that holy Councell. Againe, *Possesine* rejecting that which *Liberatus* writeth of the fift Councell, gives a most just exception against all that he writeth either touching *Theodorus* of *Cesarea*, as being an Origenist, or of the occasiō of this controversie about the 3. Chapters, as if it did arise from the cōdemning of *Origen*, in all this *Liberatus* by the Jesuites confession was deceived by the false relation of others, they a-

c In Brev. ca. 24

f In notis suis in Brev. Liber. 10. 2. Conc. pa. 626.

g Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 5. § Causa Bell. et Baronius in Liber. in breviorio, hec cautè legenda admoneris. Binius loco citato.

h In Appar. in verbo *Liberatus*, i libid.

k. *Apol. 1. contra  
Ruffin. ad Pam-  
mach. et Marcel.  
pa. 204.*

gree not to the truth, nor to the narrations of Catholike fathers. *Liberatus* being an earnest favourer and defender of *Theodorus Mopsuestenus*, could not chuse but hate *Theodorus* of *Cesarea*, for seeking to have him and his writings condemned: The saying of *Ierome*<sup>k</sup> ought here to take place, *Professa inimicitia suspicionem habent mendacij*; the report of a professed enemy ought to be suspected as a lye. The true cause why *Liberatus* is so violent against *Theodorus* of *Cesarea*, was not for that *Theodorus* was an Origenist, (as *Liberatus*, and out of him *Baronius*, slandereth him) but because this *Theodorus* condemned the writings of *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia* whom *Liberatus* defended, and the two other Chapters. Neither was the condemning of *Origen* the occasion of condemning the three Chapters, as *Liberatus* untruly reporteth, but as both *Iustinian* and the whole Councell witnesseth; the true occasion thereof were the Nestorian heretikes, who pretending and boasting the three Chapters to bee allowed in the Councell of *Chalcedon*, both the Catholikes, in defence of the Councell, justly denied the same, and the Emperour first, then the Councell to confirme the faith, condemned the three Chapters, which were the overthrow of the faith, as before<sup>l</sup> wee have proved.

l. *Ca. 1. supra.*

17. This were enough to oppose to all that *Facundus* and *Liberatus* say, two defenders of the three Chapters, and so professed enemies both to the Catholike truth defined in the fift Councell, and to *Theodorus* of *Cesarea*, who first of all suggested the condemning of them to the Emperour *Iustinian*: But now, besides this just exception against the Cardinals witnesses I will adde two cleare and authentike proofes to demonstrate both *Liberatus*, and after him *Baronius* unjustly and falsly to slander *Theodorus* of *Cesarea* for an Origenist. The former is his owne subscription to the fift Councell. In that Councell, among other heretikes, *Origen* is not only expressly & by name condemned, & that in their definitive sentence; but an Anathema also denounced against all who doe not condemne and anathematize him: these are the words of the Councell, <sup>m</sup> *If any doe not anathematize Arius, Emonius, Macedonius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Origen, with their impious writings, talis anathema sit, such an one let him bee accursed.* To this Synodall decree did all the 165. Bishops in the Councell consent and subscribe; the eighth man was this *Theodorus* of *Cesarea*, who subscribed <sup>n</sup> in this manner, *I Theodorus, decrevi quae proposita sunt, have decreed these things which are proposed, and I confesse that the truth is as all those Chapters and doctrines above named (of which this against Origen is the eleaventh) doe containe: when Theodorus himselfe confesseth Origen and his writings to bee condemned, accurseth them, yea, and all who doe not accurse them, is it not a vile and unexcusable calumny in Liberatus and in Baronius, to revile him as a patron of Origen?*

m. *Coll. 8. pa. 387  
a. b.*

n. *Coll. eadem  
pa. 388. b.*

18. Perhaps you will say hee was in former time an Origenist, but at the time of the fift Councell hee was become a new man. Though this were admitted, yet cannot *Baronius* bee excused, for calling him after that fift Councell an heretike, an Origenist: But hee was still the same man, both now and before orthodoxall, as by the other evidence,

dence, taken from the Emperours Edict in condemning Origen, will appeare, when the defenders of Origen, both for their number, and insolency, grew very troublesome in the East; specially about Ierusalem. Pelagius and Mennas, as Liberatus<sup>o</sup> saith, at the instigation of some religious Monks, intreated the Emperour that Origen and his heresies might be condemned: the Emperour thereupon published a very large and religious Edict against Origen, which he directed to Mennas, and the copy thereof he sent also to Vigilius, and to other Patriarks; after many other things the Emp. thus writeth, *We, desiring to put away all offence from the holy Church, & to leave it without blemish, following the divine Scriptures, & holy fathers, who have cast out and justly anathematized Origen and his impious doctrine, have sent this our Epistle unto you, wherein we exhorte you, that you call an assembly or Synod of all the holy Bishops and Abbots who are now in Constantinople, and that you see that all of them doe in writing anathematize Origen, and his wicked doctrines, and all the Chapters out of him under-written; and further that you send the Copy of what you have done in this cause (to all other Bishops and Abbois within your Patriarkship) that they also may all doe the like.* Besides this, the Emperour yet commands, *that none be ordained Bishop or chosen into any Monastery, unlesse forthwith in a booke they accurse and anathematize, as Arius, Sabellus, Nestorius, Eutyches, and the rest, so also Origen and his impious doctrines.* Thus writ the Emperour, and what in this manner hee commanded Mennas to doe in his Patriarkship, the like was Vigilius to doe in the Romane, Zoilus in the Alexandrian, Euphrenius in the Antiochian. That, according as the Emperour commanded, this was done, Liberatus<sup>9</sup> is witnesse; so that by all the Bishops in the world that then were, and by such as were after this to bee ordained, Origen with his impious doctrines was to bee condemned and accursed. Particularly of the Synod or Bishops at Constantinople Baronius<sup>r</sup> confesseth, *The Emperour admonished Mennas to assemble a Synod, by which all these things which he had written against Origen might bee confirmed, quod & factum fait, which was accordingly done; and, as Cedrenus<sup>t</sup> saith, their sentence was this; We condemne all these errors of Origen, & omnes qui ita sentiunt, & sentiunt, and all who do either now or hereafter shall think as he doth, condemning themselves with an anathema, if either then they did thinke so, or ever hereafter should think the like.* That Theodorus, though he had remained at Cefarea subscribed to this sentence, I thinke none can doubt; the Emperours command being so strict to all Patriarks: But indeed it seemeth that Theodorus was not onely at Constantinople at this time, and there subscribed, but that hee was one of the chiefe agents with the Emperour to publish this Edict; for of him Evagrius<sup>r</sup> witnesseth, that, *cum Iustiniano assidue versabatur, he was continually conversant with the Emperour, hee was faithfull, and especially necessary unto him, of him Liberatus<sup>u</sup> saith, that hee was, dilectus & familiaris Principum, deare and familiar both with the Emperour and Emperesse; of him<sup>x</sup> Baronius testifieth that he was *prapostens armiger Iustiniani, the Champion of Iustinian, for so saith he, I may well call him that was used to sit at the Emperours Elbow, yea, of whom<sup>y</sup> the Emperour had conceived so great an opinion, that hee thought it the chiefe point of his duty or piety,**

• Lococitato.

p Edictum Iustiniani contra Origenem. extat in 2. Con. pa. 482.

q Diffinitio in Originem damnatio, quam subscribentes, &amp;c. Liber. ca. 23. r An. 538. nu. 83

t Ced. in compend. Annal.

u Lib. 4. ca. 37.

v Cd. 24. x An. 451. nu. 4

y An. 564. nu. 7



*vixus semper inharere Vestigijs*, alwayes to tread in the footsteps of *Theodorus*. Thus *Baronius*. Seeing *Theodorus* was so neare unto, so potent with the Emperour, so highly esteemed by him, that hee alwayes trode in his steps, how could *Theodorus* bee a patron of *Origen*, when the Emperour himselfe accursed, and commanded all others to accurse him? Did not *Theodorus* treade out this path of an anathema unto the Emperour? or had he been an Origenist, how could the Emperour, following him step by step, be an enemy to *Origen*? Or to omit many other like consequences, seeing the Synod of *Constantinople*, (as, besides *Baronius*, *Liberatus* witnesseth) that is, all the Bishops there present (among whom *Theodorus* being neare and deare unto the Emperour, and so continually conversant with him, was doubtlesse one, and one of the chiefe) condemned *Origen*, it is not to bee doubted but that he was one of the first and chiefe Bishops that subscribed in that Synod to the condemnation of him. Now this was done in the 12.<sup>th</sup> yeare of *Iustinian*, that is, full fourteene yeares before the fift Councell, so ancient, so constant was the detestation of *Theodorus* towards *Origen*.

Hoc tempore  
(12. is annus  
Iustin.) Con-  
stantinopoli  
magnum agita-  
tum est de Ori-  
gene iudicium.  
Bar. an. 538. nu.  
31. et Conc. 5.  
habitu an. 27.  
Iustin.

\* Edict. Iust. co-  
tra Originem  
in sup.

19. Will any now judge otherwise of *Baronius* than a malicious slanderer? who raileth against *Theodorus* as the most earnest Patron of *Origen*, whom his owne publike and constant profession and subscription testifieth to have accursed *Origen* with all his heresies; yea, to have accursed all that doe either defend him, or think as *Origen* did, though outwardly and openly he doe not defend him, for that was one Article, \* to which *Theodorus*, and the whole Synod under *Mennas* subscribed; a curse be to *Origen* with all his execrable doctrine, a curse bee to every one who thinketh the same which he did, or who at any time doth presume to defend the same.

20. What are the partiall, uncertaine, and malicious reports of *Facundus*, of *Liberatus*, or of the Surian *Cyrill* (to adde him also among them) to these undoubted and authentike records of Councils? when wee reade and see the evident subscription of *Theodorus* proclaiming him to condemne and accurse *Origen*, what vanitie, malice and hatred of truth is this in the Cardinall, to alleage two, or if you please, three partiall testimonies against that evidence which condemneth them, and all that they can say? So unfortunate is the Cardinall in all that he undertakes in this cause, that hee doth not onely speake *præter*, but *contra*, directly contrary to the truth, whereof, as in other passages, so in this touching *Theodorus*, wee have seene so faire and cleare evidences.

CAP. XXIII.

*How unjustly Baronius excepteth against the Acts of the fift Councell, as being corrupted, and of no credit; and a refutation in generall of the same.*

1. **B**aronius perceiving right well, that all which heretofore hath beene said either against the Emperour, or the Emperesse, or the Edict, or *Theodorus* the supposed author of it, is not sufficient in any measure either to defend, or excuse *Vigilius*; in the next place he taketh a very uncouth & unusuall, but a most sure course, whereby hee may not onely weaken, but utterly overthrow all that hath or can be said against the Pope in this cause; for the *Acts* of the fift generall Councell being the most authentike records that can bee produced, to prove *Vigilius* and all that defend him, to bee heretikes; the Cardinall, and after him *Binius* will now no longer hacke at this or that person, which were agents in the cause, and but petty branches, but now hee will strike at the very roote, calling into question the Acts and evidences themselves, striving to prove them to bee of no credit; which if hee can doe, all the rest, whatsoever can bee said, will most easily bee rejected. Now because *Baronius* was willing in this passage to shew not onely the utmost subtilty of his wit, but his exact diligence in picking out every quarrell, that art or malice could suggest against the Acts of this holy Councell; I must intreate the reader not to thinke it tedious (though unto mee this was a matter almost of greatest trouble and difficultie) to heare patiently, and weigh with equity of judgement the manifold exceptions against these Acts, which he hath collected, or rather scattered upon every occasion which offered it selfe here and there, that by his inculcating, and ingeminating of the accusation he might breed some opinion of the truth thereof.

2. And before I enter into examination of the particulars, let me put the reader in minde of one or two considerations which may in generall concerne them all. The first is, that though the Cardinall, and *Binius* following him, have spared no labour to sift these Acts as diligently as Satan did Saint *Peter*, and have objected ten or twelve speciall corruptions in them, yet not any thing which they mention, or against which they except, doth any way so touch or concerne the cause of the *Three Chapters*, whereof wee have intreated; as either to shew that the Councell condemneth them not; or that *Vigilius* defendeth them not by his definitive & *Apostolicall Constitutio*, or that the Councell by their Synodall sentence and consenting judgement did not for that cause condemne, anathematize, and accurse for heretikes all that defend them, and so Pope *Vigilius*, among the rest, and al that defend him or his *Apostolicall Constitution*. All these are matters of so certaine, evident, and undoubted truth, by the Acts, that *Baronius* or

*Binius* could finde nothing at all to blemish or darken them. So then, though the Acts were admitted in 1000. or 10000. other points to bee corrupted, mutilated, and altered, yet the Cardinall and *Binius* are never a whit the nearer; the maine point at which they aime, is to excuse *Vigilius*, and those that defend him, but notwithstanding all that they have said, (and they have said all that industry, having borrowed serpentine eyes, could finde out) both *Vigilius* himselfe, and all who defend him, and those are all who defend the Popes infallibility in defining causes of faith, that is, all Papists, remaine still, as convicted, accused, and anathematized heretikes, and that by the judgment of an holy generall Council, approved by all succeeding, both Popes and Councils, till the time of *Luther* and *Leo* the tenth.

3. The second thing which I observe is, that corruptions which happely may bee crept into some Synodall Acts, or other writings, whether by mutilations, additions, or alterations, are no just cause to reject, as unworthy of credit, all the Acts of that Council, or writings of the author. Admit this once, what credit can be given to the Nicene and Constantinopolitane Councils? whose Acts to bee miserably maimed, none is ignorant? yea, even the very Canons also to bee corrupted *Bellarmino*<sup>a</sup> and *Baronius*<sup>b</sup> doe professe and prove: The like corruption *Baronius* noteth in the first Ephesine Council, wherein is set<sup>c</sup> downe, among other acts, *decretum Regum*, for the banishment of the Nestorians, of which *Baronius*<sup>d</sup> saith, *plura simul mendacia insuta habent*, there are many lyes sowed up in these Acts. In like sort in the Council of *Chalcedon* is inserted among the Acts of the third Session<sup>e</sup>, an Edict of the Emperor *Valentinianus* and *Martianus*, which was written a long<sup>f</sup> yeare after the Council was ended; and therefore must of necessity be acknowledged to bee foisted, and unjustly inserted into the Acts. Of the sixth Council *Bellarmino*<sup>g</sup> saith, that it without doubt is corrupted, and whatsoever is found there of *Honorius*, is falsly inserted. Of it *Binius*<sup>h</sup> after *Baronius*<sup>i</sup> saith, the Acts of it, are in many places depraved; and whatsoever is there reported to be said or done by *Honorius*, all that is added by the Monothelites. Of the seventh *Binius*<sup>k</sup> thus writeth, This fourth Action is in divers places faulty, and in the History of the Image crucified at *Be-risus* it containeth divers Apocryphall narrations concerning the Image of Christ made by *Nicodemus*. Of the eighth Council, that the Canons thereof are corrupted, and some inserted by *Anastasius*, their owne *Raderus*<sup>l</sup> will perswade them. Let the Baronian reason against the Acts of this first Council bee applyed to these: He having found among these, one Epistle of *Theodore*s which hee supposeth to bee a counterfeit, concludeth upon that one example in this manner, *quam fidem rogo merentur acta huiusmodi, qua sunt his contexta commentis; what credis, I pray you, doe such Acts as these of the first Council deserve, which are intangled in such fictions?* May not the selfe same reason be much more justly alleaged against the Nicene and Constantinopolitane Canons; against the Acts of the Council at *Ephesus*, at *Chalcedon*; against the first, seventh and eighth Synods, in every one of which, some, &c in divers, more corruptions, not onely mutilations, but alterations,

<sup>a</sup> Probatur Canon illos (Nicenos) non esse integros. Lib. 2. de Pontif. Rom. ca. 25. §. Omiffa  
<sup>b</sup> Quod Canon 6. Con. Nic. mutilatus sit, &c. Bar. an. 225. nu. 125. & Canon iste (5. concilij Constantinopolitani) suspectus, imo plane addititius esse atque suppositus habetur, &c. Bar. an. 381 nu. 35.  
<sup>c</sup> Tom. 5. Conc. Ephes. ca. 11. d. An. 481. nu. 173.  
<sup>e</sup> Pag. 84. b. f. concilium finitum est mense Novemb. in Cōf. Martiani et Adelphi. Bar. an. 451. nu. 160. Edictum vero scriptum 7. Kal. Febr. Cōf. Apollonio.  
<sup>g</sup> Bell. lib. 4. de Pontif. Rom. ca. 11. §. Ad secundum depravata sunt. Binius. not. in Con. 6. §. Acta.  
<sup>h</sup> Acta concilij multis in locis i. Bar. an. 681. nu. 13.  
<sup>k</sup> Not. in Conc. Nicen. 2. et Acti. 4.  
<sup>l</sup> Viginti septem Canones ex Anastasio codice sumpti nullius dubitet, et hi duo Canones non nisi ex Anastasio videntur accipi. Rad. in Obser. ad Conc. 8. pa. 448.



tions, and commentitious writings are inserted by their owne confession? Let *Baronius* answer here his owne question, *Quam fidem rogo?* I pray you then, what credit may bee given to such Canons or Acts as are those of *Nice*, of *Constantinople*, of *Ephesus*, of *Chalcedon*, of the sixth, seventh, or eighth Councell? they all must by the Cardinals reason be rejected, as Canons and Acts of no worth, of no credit at all: Nor they onely, but all the workes of *Augustine*, of *Athanasius*, of *Ierome*, and almost all the holy Fathers: none of them all by this *Baronian* reason, deserve any credit, for among their writings are inserted many suppositious and factitious tracts, as the booke *de variis Quaestionibus Scripturae*, the Sermon of the Assumption of the blessed Virgin, and many more in *Athanasius*, the Epistle of *Augustine* to *Cyrill*, and *Cyrills* to *Austen*; the author<sup>n</sup> of which was not onely an Impostor, but an heretike; the booke *de Spiritu & litera*, the booke of questions of the old and new Testament; which is hereticall, and an heape of the like in *Austen*; the Commentaries on *Pauls* Epistles, which favour of Pelagianisme; the Epistle to *Demetrias* concerning virginity, and 100. like in *Ierome*. *Qua fides rogo?* what credit can bee given to these bookes or writings of *Austen*, *Athanasius*, *Ierome*, or the rest, in which are found so many fictitious, & heretical treatises, falsely ascribed unto them, mingled and inserted among their writings? Truly, I cannot devise what might move the great Card. to make such a collection, and reason, as from some corruptions crept into the bookes of fathers, or Acts of Councils, to inferre, that the whole Acts or writings are unworthy of any credit, but onely as *Jacke Cade* had a purpose to burne all authentick records and writings of law; that, as hee boasted, all the law might proceed from his own mouth; so the Cardinal intended to play a right *Jacke Cade* with all the ancient Councils and Fathers, that having utterly, though not abolished, yet disgraced, and made them all by this his reason and collection unworthy of any credit; his owne mouth might bee an Oracle to report without controulment all histories of ancient matters; and what his Cardinalship should please to say in any matter; or to set downe in his Annals, that all men should believe, as if the most authentick Records in the world had testified the same: How much better and more advisedly might the Cardinall have done, to have wished all corruptions to bee removed? whatsoever can be certainly proved in any Acts of Councils, or writings of Fathers to be added unto them, that to be quite cut off; whatsoever might bee found wanting, that to bee added; whatsoever to be altered or perverted, that to be amended, and not in the blindness of his hatred, against this one sixth Councell, to fight like one of the *Andabata*, against all the rest, and with one stroke to cashier all the Acts and Canons of Councils, all the writings of Fathers or Historians, because, forsooth, one or some few corruptions have either by negligence or error of writing, or by fraud and malice of some malignant hand crept into them.

4. The third thing which I observe, is, that whereas *Baronius* so often and so spitefully declameth against the Acts of this Councell, as imperfect and corrupted; this his whole accusation proceedeth of malice

m Poss. Appar.  
in Athan. p. 127.  
n Poss. in Aug.  
pa. 147.

o Poss. in Hier.  
pa. 751.

lice to the Councell and these Acts, rather than of judgement or of truth; for I doe constantly affirme, and who so ever pleaseth to peruse the Councels shall certainly finde, (and, if he deale ingenuously, will confesse the same) that as of al the general Councels which go before this fift, for integrity of the Acts, none is better, or any way comparable to this, save that of *Chalcedon*: so of all that follow it none at all is to bee preferred, nor any way to bee counted equall with it, unlesse that which they call the sixt Councell, that is, so much of the Acts of that Synod as concerne the cause of the Monothelites, leaving out the *Trullane* Canons: This, whosoever is exercised in the Volumes of Councels cannot choose but observe. The Nicene & Constantinopolitane being so miserably maimed, that scarce wee have so much as a few shreds or chips of the most magnificent buildings of those Councels, which, if they could bee recovered, no treasures are sufficient to redeeme a worke of that worth and value, a worke *non gemmis, neque purpura vanale, neque auro*. That of *Ephesus* is a little helped indeed by *Pelicanus*, but yet it remaines so imperfect, so confused, and disorderly, that as *Diogenes* sought men in the most thronged multitudes of men, so among those very Acts & large Tomes of the Councels, the reader shall be forced to seeke the Acts of the *Ephesine* Councell. The Acts of the second *Nicene*, and of the next to it, which they call the eighth, are so doubtfull, that not onely this or that part, but the whole fabrick of them both is questionable, whether they were the Synodall Acts, or but a relation framed by *Anastasius*, as hee thought best. Of all the eight Councels, the Acts of *Chalcedon*, this fift, and the sixt have beene most safely preserved, and like the river *Arethusa* have strongly passed through so many corrupt ages and hands, and yet without tainture of the salt, deliver unto us the cleare and sweete current of antiquity and truth: And verily, when I seriously compare the wrack of other Councels with the entirenesse of these three, I cannot but admire and magnifie with all my might the gracious providence, wisdom, and love of God to his Church, for in every one of these there is an unresistable force of truth, against that Antichristian authority & supremacy which is now made the foundation of the Popish faith; the sixt in the cause of *Honorius*, the fift in this cause of *Vigilius*, and that of *Chalcedon*, in curbing the Popes Legates, in crossing the decree, and knowne resolution of Pope *Leo*, and in being a most lively patterne of that rightfull and ancient authority which Emperours then held above all the Bishops in the Councell; but now the Pope usurpes both above all Bishops, Emperours and Councels. God would by these monuments of antiquity pull downe the lofty Towers, and raze from the very bottome that foundation of *Babylon*, which can never be firme and settled; hee would have, besides other particular witnesses, these unconquerable and irresistible forces of these ancient and generall Councels, against which no just exception can be taken: and although I will not excuse the acts of these, nor any of them from all defects and blemishes whatsoever, yet I dare boldly averre, that they are so few, so light, and of so small importance, that the maine controversies handled in them, or relying on them, cannot be prejudicated thereby, they

they being rather the errors of the Collectors, or of the writers, and exscribers of these Councils, than of the Councils themselves: And particularly for this fifth Council, against which *Baronius* doth so furiously declame: I doubt not to make it evident, that all the faults; which, after much prying, hee hath objected unto the *Acts* thereof, will prove so many evident testimonies of his owne most fraudulent and corrupt dealing, and not the defects or corruptions in the *Acts* of this Council. But let us view the particulars.

## CAP. XXV.

*The first alteration of the Synodall Acts pretended by Baronius, for that the text of the Council at Chalcedon is changed therein, refuted.*



THE corruptions which *Baronius*, and out of him *Binius* objecteth, are according to the grammaticall division reduced to three sorts of irregularity: Some by variation or alteration, others by defect or mutilation, the rest by redundance or addition. In the first ranke hee pretendeth three examples; the first which seemeth to be of greatest moment, and carrieth the greatest colour of probability is the corrupting of a certaine text of

the Council at *Chalcedon* cited by this fifth Synod. Heare the accusation in *Baronius* his owne words, *We may not here omit*, saith he <sup>a</sup>, *to note the craft of the Grecians, who, contrary to right and equitie, have corrupted the holy text of the Synodall Acts; by adding unto the Council of Chalcedon those words, about which there was much contention in the time of Pope Hormisdas, when certaine suspected of Eutychianisme, specially some Scythian Monkes, did labour that unto the holy Countell of Chalcedon these words might bee added, Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum unum esse de sancta Trinitate; which when they could not obtaine, because the Synod was well enough without that addition, here now (in this fifth Council) where the Epistle of Ibas is compared with the profession of the Council at Chalcedon; they recite these words of the Synod [Chalcedonensis sancta Synodus in definitione quam de fide fecit, pradicat Deum verbum incarnatum esse hominem] the holy Synod of Chalcedon in the definition which it made of faith, doth profess God the Word to have beene incarnate and made man; and they adde unto the words of the Synod, [qui est Dominus noster Iesus Christus, unus de sancta Trinitate; who is our Lord Iesus Christ, one of the holy Trinitie;] as if the Synod of Chalcedon had professed that, whereas they rather would call Christ, *unam personam sancta Trinitatis*, than *unum de sancta Trinitate*. Thus *Baronius*: In which few words of his there are contained so many notable untruths, and hereticall frauds, that without a rare dexterity in that craft, hee could not have easily contrived and touched them in so small a roome.*

a An. 553. num. 214.



2. First, that they who contended to have Christ called *unum de sancta Trinitate*, were heretikes, or Eutychians, or unjustly suspected thereof, is not onely untrue, but bewrayes the Cardinals obstinate and obdurate affection to Nestorianisme; for as *Dionysius Exiguus* in his Preface to the Epistle of *Proclus*, witnesseth, and most truly, the disciples of *Theodorus Mopsuestenus* began to teach an impious faith to the people, with most crafty subtilty professing the Trinity to bee in such sort of one Essence, as *Christum Dominum nostrum unum ex Trinitate nullatenus faterentur*, that they would by no means confesse Christ our Lord to be one of the Trinity; and thereupon they taught a quaternity in the persons. If *Baronius* esteeme it heresie to professe Christ, *unum de sancta Trinitate*, then is hee certainly by this, besides all other evidences, convicted to be a Nestorian heretike, for it is an Article of their Nestorian, and repugnant to the Catholike faith, to deny or doubt to call Christ, *unum de sancta Trinitate*.

3. Secondly, that the Councell of Chalcedon made ever any doubt to professe Christ to bee *unum de sancta Trinitate*, or that they would rather call him, *unam personam Trinitatis*, is another vile Nestorian slander, and hereticall untruth of *Baronius*. The Councell of Chalcedon, faith *Iustinian*, approved the Epistle of *Proclus*, wherein it is taught, that we ought to confesse our Lord Iesus Christ to be one of the holy Trinity: *Proclus*, faith *Dionysius Exiguus*, did marvellously resist that impiety, and hee taught our Lord Iesus Christ, *unum de Trinitate esse*, to bee one of the Trinity. When the Nestorians troubled the Church about this matter, *Iustinian* set forth a most religious Imperiall Edict, wherein hee commanded all to professe Christ to bee *unum de Trinitate*; wee anathematize, faith he, every heresie, especially *Nestorius*, and those who thinke, or have thought as he did; wee anathematize those who deny or will not confesse our Lord Iesus Christ, *unum esse ex sancta & consubstantiali Trinitate*, to bee one of the holy and consubstantiall Trinity. This Imperiall Edict the very next yeare after it was published was confirmed by Pope *Iohn*, who thus writeth to the Emperour, You for the love of the faith, and to remove heresie, have published an Edict, which, because it agreeth with the Apostolike doctrine, wee confirme by our authority: and againe, You have writ and published those things, which both the Apostolike doctrine, and the venerable authority of the holy Fathers hath decreed, & nos in omnibus confirmamus, and we confirme it in all points: This your faith is the true and certaine religion, this all the Fathers & Bishops of Rome, and the Apostolike See hath hitherto inviolably kept; this confession whosoever doth contradict, hee is an alien from the holy Communion, and from the Catholike Church. Thus Pope *Iohn*. What can any man in the world now thinke else of *Baronius*, but condemne him for an accursed heretike? Hee denyes the Councell of Chalcedon to embrace that profession, *unum de Trinitate*, which, as the Emperour and Pope witnesseth, it earnestly embraceth; he not onely suspecteth in this place, but in plaine termes else-where, he calleth the Scythian Monks Eutychians, heretikes, and oppugners of the Councell of Chalcedon, and that for this cause, for that both themselves professed, and required others to professe Christ to bee *unum de sancta Trinitate*; nor content here-

b Exat in Bib.  
3. pat. tom. 3.

e Leg. 7. de sum-  
ma Trinit. ca. 4.

d Loco citato.

e Edict. extat  
apud Bar. an.  
533. nu. 7. 9.

f Epist. I. Iob. 2.  
ad Iustin. in. 3.  
Cont. pa. 404.  
et Bar. an. 534.  
nu. 15. et seq.

g Plaud campe-  
ritur eisdem ip-  
so (Scythia  
Monachos) Eu-  
tychianos fuisse  
hereticos. Bar.  
an. 519. nu. 99.

herewith hee addeth these words, the heresie whereof with no niter can bee washt away: hee faineth, saith *Baronius*<sup>h</sup>, that these words, *unum de Trinitate est crucifixus*, are to bee added for the strengthening and explaining of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, which sentence (*unum de Trinitate est crucifixus*) the Legates of the Apostolike Sea, *prorsus rejciendam esse putarunt*, thought to bee such as ought utterly to be rejected, as being never used by the Fathers in their Synodall sentences; *latere enim sciebant sub melle venenum*, for they knew that poison did lye under this bony. Now seeing by *Iustinians Edict*, and the Popes confirmation thereof, all, who either refuse, or who will not professe Christ to be *unum de sancta Trinitate*, are accursed, and excluded from the Catholike Church and communion; *Baronius* cannot possibly escape that just censure, who condemneth that profession as hereticall, and as repugnant to the faith of *Chalcedon*. Thus while the Cardinall labours to prove by this the Acts of the fift Councell to bee corrupt, hee demonstrates himselfe to bee both untrue, hereticall, rejected out of the Church, and a slanderer of the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, as favouring the heresie of *Nestorius*.

4. Thirdly, whereas hee saith, that the Scythian Monkes would *inferre verba ista in Synodum Chalcedonensem*, bring or thrust in those words into the Councell of *Chalcedon*, it is a slander without all colour or ground of truth: they saw divers Nestorians obstinate in denying this truth, that Christ was *unus de sancta Trinitate*, who pretended for them that these words were not expressed in the Councell of *Chalcedon*; the Monkes and Catholikes most justly replied, that though the expresse words were not there, yet the sense of them was decreed in that Councell, that this confession was but an expression or explication of that which was truly, implicately, and more obscurely decreed at *Chalcedon*. To falsifie the Acts of that Councell, or adde one syllable unto it, otherwise than by way of explanation or declaration, that, the Monks and Catholikes, whom *Baronius* calleth Eutychians, never sought to doe, as at large appeares by that most learned and orthodoxall booke written by *Iohannes Maxentius* about this very cause, against which booke, and the Author thereof, the more earnestly *Baronius* doth oppose himselfe, and call them hereticall, hee doth not thereby one whit disgrace them (his tongue and pen is no slander, at least not to weighed) but the more he still intangles himselfe in the heresie of the Nestorians, out of which in that cause none can extricate him, as in another Treatise I purpose God willing, to demonstrate.

5. Fourthly, whereas *Baronius* saith, that the Scythian Monkes prevailed not in the dayes of *Hormisda*, *quod absque additamento Synodus rectè consisteret*, because the Synod of *Chalcedon* was well enough without that addition, hee shewes a notable sleight of his hereticall fraud. That the Synod is well enough without adding those words, as an expresse part of the Synodall decree, or as written *totidem verbis* by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, is most true, but nothing to the purpose; for neither the Scythian Monkes nor any Catholikes did affirme them so to bee, or wish them so to bee added, for that had beene to say

say in expresse words, wee will have the decree falsified, or written in other words than it was by the Councell: But that the Synod was well enough without this additament, as an explication of it, and declaration of the sense of that Councell, is most untrue; for both *Iustinian* by his Ediēt commanded, and Pope *Iohn* by his *Apostolike* authoritie confirmed, that to bee the true meaning, both of that Councell, and of all the holy Fathers: And when a controversie is once moved, and on foote, whether Christ ought to bee called *unus de sancta Trinitate*, for a man then to deny this, or deny it to bee decreed in the Councell of *Chalcedon*, or to deny that it ought to be added as a true explanation of that Councell, is to deny the whole Catholike faith, and the decrees of the foure first Councils; and though one shall say and professe in words, as did *Hormisdas* and his Legates, that they hold the whole Councell of *Chalcedon*, yet in that they expressly deny this truth, which was certainly decreed at *Chalcedon*, their generall profession shall not excuse them, but their expresse deniall of this one particular shall demonstrate them, both to bee heretikes, and expressly to beleeve and hold an heresie repugnant to that Councell, which in a generality they professe to hold, but indeed and truth doe not. Even as the expresse denying of the manhood, or Godhead of Christ, or resurrection of the dead shall convince one to bee an heretike, though hee professe himselfe in a generality to beleeve and hold all that the holy Scriptures doe teach, or the Nicene fathers decree. If *Baronius* his words, that the Councell is right without that additament, bee taken in the former sense, they are idle, vaine, and spoken to no purpose, which, of the Cardinals deepe wisdom is not to bee imagined: If they bee taken (as I suppose they are) in the latter sense, they undeniably demonstrate him to bee a Cardinall Nestorian.

6. But leaving all the rest of the Cardinals frauds in this passage, let us come to that last clause which concernes the corrupting of the Councell of *Chalcedon*. This, saith he, which in *Hormisdas*es dayes they could not, now in this fift Synod they obtained, now they added to the words of the Synod this clause, *qui est Dominus unus de sancta Trinitate*: A very perilous corruption sure, to expresse that clause which all the Bishops of Rome, (*semper excipio Hormisdas*) with all Catholikes, beleeved and taught, which, whosoever denieth or wil not professe, is anathematized, and excluded from the Catholike Church. Is not this thinke you a very fore corruption of the Councell of *Chalcedon*? Is not the Cardinall a rare man of judgement that could spie such a maine fault in these A&S of the fift Councell, that they professe Christ to be *unum de sancta Trinitate*, to which profession both they and all other were bound under the censure of an anathema.

7. Yea, but in the A&S those words are cited as the words of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, whose they are not. A meere fancy and calumny of the Cardinall: they are plainly set downe as the words of the fift Synod, whose indeed they are; and it relateth nor precisely the words of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, nor what it there expressed, *totidem verbis*, but the true summe and substance of what is there decreed.



creed. For thus they say<sup>i</sup>, *The holy Synod of Chalcedon in the definition which it made of faith, doth professe God the Word incarnate, to be made man;* this is all they report of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, as by the opposition of *Ibas* his *Epistle* is apparent, wherein they oppose not that he denied Christ to be one of the Trinity, but that hee called them heretikes who taught the Word incarnate to be made man. That clause which they adde [That Christ is one of the Trinity] is an addition of the fifth Councell it selfe, explicating that of Christ, which the *Emperours Edict* bound them to professe, as being the true sense and meaning of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, but not as being word for word set downe in the decree of *Chalcedon*. And even as he were more than ridiculous, who would accuse one to corrupt the Councell of *Chalcedon* for saying they professed Christ to be God and man, who was borne in *Bethleem*, and fled from *Herod* into *Aegypt*; so is the Cardinall as ridiculous in objecting this as a corruption of the Synod, or addition to the Councell of *Chalcedon*, that they say the Councell taught the Word of God to bee man, who is our Lord Iesus Christ, one of the holy Trinity. Both additions are true, but neither of them affirmed to be expressly, and *totidem verbis*, set downe in the Councell of *Chalcedon*. Why but looke to the Cardinals prooffe; for he would not for any good affirme such a matter without prooffe. What? doe yee aske for prooffe of the Cardinall? I tell you, it is prooffe enough that he sayth it: and truly in this poynt he produceth neither any prooffe, nor any shadow of reason to prove either that those words are falsely inserted into the Acts of the fifth Councell, or that the fifth Councell cited them as the very expresse words of the Councell of *Chalcedon*: all the prooffe is grounded on his old Topicke place *Ipse dixit*, which is a sory kind of arguing, against any that love the truth: for although against the Pope or their popish cause, any thing which he writeth is a very strong evidence against them, seeing the Cardinall is very circumspect & wary to let nothing, no not a syllable fall from him which may in the least wise seem to prejudice the Popes dignity, or the cause of their Church, unlesse the maine force and undeniable evidence of truth doe wrest and wring it from his pen: yet in any matter of history, wherein he may advantage the Pope, or benefit their cause, it is not by many degrees so good to say, the *illustrissimus Cardinalis* affirms it, which is now growne a familiar kinde of prooffe among them<sup>k</sup>, as to say, *Ovid*, *Aesop*, or *Iacobus Voraginis* affirms it, therefore it is certainly true. His Annals in the art of fraudulent, vile, and pernicious untruths farre excell the most base fictitious Poemes or Legends that ever as yet have seene the Sunne:

i coll. 6. pa.  
375. a.

<sup>k</sup> Vide Grege.  
tractatum variis  
& alios ejus  
satiras.

## CAP. XXVI.

The second alteration of the Synodall Acts pretended by Baronius, for that Ibas is sayd therein to have denyed the Epistle written to Maris to be his, refuted.

a Dum falsa  
quedam ibi (in  
Actis 5. Concilij)  
asserita reperiri-  
tur, de impostura  
non mediocrem  
suspicionem in-  
ducunt: cum  
vix ibi dictum  
habetur, Ibas  
negasse Epistolā  
esse suam. Bar.  
an. 553. nu. 211  
b Duo aut plura  
mendacia de Iba  
epistola leguntur.  
Bin. Notū in  
Conc. 5. pa. 605.  
c. Acta Conc. 9.  
nō uno loco indi-  
cant quod Ibas  
Epistolam non  
agnoverit, verū  
hac sententia,  
c. ibid. p. 607. a  
c Ibas non est  
ausus eam suam  
dicere Epistolam  
Iustin. editum  
pa. 496. b. Epi-  
stolam Ibas de-  
negat suam.  
Greg. lib. 7. E.  
pist. 53.  
d Abnegans E-  
pistolam. Coll. 6.  
pa. 563. b. Eo  
quod abnegabat  
Ibas illa. Coll. ea-  
dem. pa. 564. a.  
Vnde & Ibas  
eam abnegabat.  
Ibid. & alibi.  
e Loco nuper ci-  
tato.  
f Loco citato.  
g Coll. 6. p. 564. a.  
Iohannes Se-  
bastian. Seleucus  
Amasius, Con-  
stantinus, Patri-  
tius, Petrus &  
Atharvius, om-  
nes Metropolita-  
ni pariter in-  
terloquuntur,  
eo quod Ibas ab-  
negavit illa, &c.



1.

He second thing which our *Momus*<sup>a</sup> carpeth at, is for that in these Acts it is sayd that *Ibas* denyed the Epistle written to *Maris*, to be his: which saith *Baronius* is untrue; for *Ibas* professed the Epistle to be his. And *Binius* not content to call it with the Cardinall an untruth, in plaine termes affirms<sup>b</sup> it to be a lye. Had not hatred to the truth corrupted or quite blinded the judgement of *Baronius* and *Binius*, they would never have quarelled with the Acts about this matter, nor for this accused them to have beene corrupt. They may as well collect the Edict of *Iustinian*, or that famous Epistle of Pope *Gregorie*, wherein he writeth of *Ibas* and the three Chapters, to be corrupted, and of no credit, as well as the Acts of the fift Councell: for in both<sup>c</sup> them the same is said concerning the denial of *Ibas* which is in these Acts. If notwithstanding the avouching of that denyall, they may passe for sincere and incorrupt, it was certainly malice and not reason that moved the Cardinall and *Binius* to carpe at the Acts for this cause: which will much more appeare, if any please but to view the Acts themselves. For this is not spoken *obiter*, nor once, but the Councell insisteth upon it, repeateth it in severall<sup>d</sup> places, and divers times; and if those words were taken away, there would be an apparent *hiatus* in the text of those Acts. The words then are truly the words of the true Acts, the corruption is onely in the braine of *Baronius* and *Binius*.

2. Now whereas the Cardinall and *Binius* so confidently affirme this to be untrue, or a lye, that *Ibas* denyed his Epistle, and so accuse the whole Councell to lye in this matter, they doe but keepe their owne tongues and pens in ure with calumnies: the untruth and lye belongs neither to the Councell, nor to the Acts, but must bee returned to themselves to whom onely it is due. For the Councells truth herein, the Emperour is a most honourable witnesse, who saith<sup>e</sup>, *Demonstratur Ibas eam abnegasse, Ibas is demonstrated, or by evident prooffe knowne, to have denyed his Epistle.* Pope *Gregory* is another witnesse above exception, who saith<sup>f</sup>, *Epistolam Ibas denegat suam, Ibas denyed the Epistle to be his:* the fift Councell also doth not onely affirme it, but prove<sup>g</sup> it by the testimony of six Metropolitan Bishops, and their interloquution in the Councell of *Chalcedon*, they all sayd they received *Ibas*, *eo quod negabat illa, because he did deny those things which were objected by his adversaries:* a great part of which was that Epistle. All these are witnesses for the Councell: what witnesses now doth the Cardinall or *Binius* bring to countervail these truly not so much as one:

one: and one were but a poore number to be opposed to so many, and so worthy men, testifying the contrary: Now whether the testimony of the Emperour, Pope Gregory, of six Metropolitans, and an whole generall approved Councell affirming this; or *Baronius* without any one witness denying this, be more credible, let the very best friends of *Baronius* judge: but *Baronius* loves to bee *Iohannes ad oppositum*, to Emperours, Popes, Bishops, and Councells: if they say any thing that pleaseeth not his palate, that is indeed, if they say the truth.

3. But yet *Baronius* hath a prooffe of his saying, which is this; because *Ibas* confessed it to be his, and hee tels us this is in the Acts of *Chalcedon*. Say he did confesse it, as I will not deny that he did; (though I verily thinke the Cardinall speaks an untruth, in saying that this is in the Acts, for I finde not in those Acts either any such expresse confession, or ought from whence it can be collected: and *Iustinian* plainly saith<sup>i</sup>, that *Ibas* durst not acknowledge it to be his, for the blasphemies contained therein,) but I admit that *Ibas* confessed it to be his. Doth it thence follow, that he denied it not to be his? might he not doe both? might he not contradict himselfe? doth not the Cardinall, (who neither for wit nor wisdom will yeeld one jote to *Ibas*,) doth not he as much in this very cause of *Ibas* Epistle: In one place he<sup>k</sup> sayth; the Epistle being produced, *non esse Iba compertam*, it was found not to be the Epistle of *Ibas*, as the Acts of *Chalcedon* doe shew: in another<sup>l</sup> place he saith the quite contrary: *The true Acts of Chalcedon have it, that Ibas confessed it to be his Epistle*. Is not this a peece of handsome worke of the Cardinall? The Epistle is his, the Epistle is not his: the Acts of *Chalcedon* say it is his; the Acts of *Chalcedon* say it is not his. Could *Vertumnus* himselfe play more cunningly, fast and loose than he doth? Might not *Ibas* doe the like? sometimes for his owne credit deny the Epistle to be his, though at other times he confessed it to be his? Is it not more likely in it selfe; more charity in others to thinke that *Ibas* did thus, than that the Emperour, Pope Gregory, and a generall Councell did all conspire to tell a lye.

4. And not to dispute that (which we have now admitted) whether he confessed it to be his or not; that he did certainly deny it to be his Epistle, if neither the fift generall Councell, nor *Iustinian*, nor Gregory had testified this, yet the Acts of the Councell of *Chalcedon* where *Ibas* himselfe was personally present, have so cleare a demonstration thereof, that I cannot sufficiently admire either the stupidity, or the most shamelesse dealing of *Baronius* and *Binius*, who with their foule mouthes call it an untruth, and a lye: for that Epistle was writ by *Ibas* not onely after the union made betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrril*, as *Iustinian*<sup>m</sup>, and the fift<sup>n</sup> Councell truly teach; but as wee have before clearly<sup>o</sup> proved, at least two yeares after the same. In that Epistle *Cyrril* is called an heretike, an Apollinarian, as both the fift Councell testifieth, saying<sup>p</sup>, *Epistola Cyrrillum sancta memoria haereticum vocat*; and the very words of the Epistle doe make evident, wherein *Ibas* saith<sup>q</sup>, *Cyrril* is found to have falne into the doctrine of Apollinaris: And againe, speaking of these twelve Chapters of *Cyrril*, which both the *Ephesine* and *Chalcedon* Councell confirme, he calls them *plena omni*

*h* Acta Germana habent Ibam confessum, eam esse suam: sed & Acta Conc. Chalced. eandem Epistolam ut Iba cognitam esse docent. Bar. an. 448. nu. 77. i loco citat.

*k* Bar. an. 432. nu. 71.

*l* Bar. 448. nu. 77

*m* Epistola facta ostenditur post unitatem ad orientales facta. E dict. Iust. loco citato.  
*n* In impia epistola post unitatem scripta ostenditur. Conc. 5. coll. 6. pa. 563.  
*o* Sup. ca. 10. p. coll. 6. pa. 575. a.  
*q* In Conc. Chalced. act. 30. pa. 113. q. i. Ibid.



impicrate, full of all impiety, and contrary to the faith. Thus writ Ibas of  
Cyrill two yeares at least after the union was fully made. Now in the  
Acts before Photius and Eustathius, which are expressed in the Coun-  
cell of Chalcedon, Ibas there professed before the Iudges, that after the  
union once made, we all, sayth he <sup>1</sup>, held communion with Cyrill, we ac-  
counted him an orthodoxall Bishop, & nullus eum appellat hereticum,  
and none after that called Cyrill an heretike: was not this a plaine deny-  
all that he writ this Epistle? for whosoever writ it calleth Cyrill an  
heretike, and that divers yeares after the union: now Ibas denyeth  
that ever after the union he called Cyrill an heretike. Could he more  
directly conclude that he writ not this Epistle? unlesse one will say  
that to deny Baronius to have written or published one word after  
the beginning of Pope Sixtus the fift, be not a certaine denyall, that  
the Annalls which goe under his name, and were all published after  
the beginning of Sixtus <sup>2</sup>, are the Annalls of Baronius. This denyall  
by an evident and most certaine consequent, (not any expresse de-  
nyall *totidem verbis*, as if Ibas had sayd, this is not my Epistle) was it  
which both Iustinian and the fift Councell meant, as their owne words  
doe declare: The Epistle, sayth Iustinian <sup>3</sup>, being full of blasphemies, and  
containing many injuries against S. Cyrill, is shewed to be written af-  
ter the union, *ex quo demonstratur Ibas eam abnegasse*, whereby it is de-  
monstrated that Ibas denyed it, (in that he sayd, that he never called Cy-  
rill an heretike after that union.) The impious Epistle, sayth the Coun-  
cell <sup>4</sup>, is shewed by the contents thereof to have beene written after the union;  
therefore it appeareth that Ibas denyed it to be his Epistle by this, in  
that he sayd that he spake nothing against Cyrill after the union: again,  
Ibas in this denyed the Epistle, *eo quod dicebat*, because he sayd <sup>5</sup>, after  
the union I am not found to have sayd ought against Saint Cyrill. Yea  
this and no other, to have beene that denyall which the Councell  
meant, Baronius knew right well; for himselfe sayth <sup>6</sup>, that it is sayd  
in the Councell, that Ibas denyed the Epistle, *ex eo*, for this cause, for that  
after the union and peace made, he denyed that he had sayd ought a-  
gainst Cyrill: yet notwithstanding all this evidence of truth, the Car-  
dinall to disgrace the Acts of this Councell, even against his owne  
knowledge and conscience affirmeth it to bee an untruth, or as Binius  
calls it, (in a most spitefull manner) a lye, that Ibas denyed this Epistle  
to be his.

1 In Conc. Chalc.  
Act. 10. p. 113. a

2 Rem primum  
eius Tomum  
dedicavit Sixto  
3. an. 1589.

3 Loco citato.

4 Loco citato.

5 Coll. 6. p. 564. a

6 an. 553. n. 211

CAP. XXVII.

The third alteration of the Synodall Aets pretended by Baronius, for that the Councell of Chalcedon is said therein to condemne the Epistle of Ibas, refused.



THE third corruption is by a mis-report and untrue relation which *Baronius* observeth in these Aets, for that in them the Councell of *Chalcedon* is said to have condemned that Epistle of *Ibas*, which he not onely saith<sup>a</sup> is untrue, (*Binius* calls<sup>b</sup> it also in plaine termes, a lye,) but addeth both that the Aets of the Councell of *Chalcedon* doe teach the contrary, and that out of those Aets hee hath before demonstrated the same. Call you this a corruption of

the Aets? why, it is the maine purpose of the Councell, it is their very judgement and resolution touching the *Three Chapters*, often and with acclamations repeated. The Epistle<sup>c</sup> is contrary to the definition, *Epistolam<sup>d</sup> definitio sancti Chalcedonenſis Concilij condemnat, definitio ejecit*; in the prooff whereof they much insist. Neither onely in the sixt collation doe they at large set downe this, but in their eighth, even in their Synodall definition<sup>e</sup> they expressely mention, that they have not onely said, but even demonstrated before, that this Epistle is in all things contrary to the definition of the Councell at *Chalcedon*; yea, they there adde, which is more, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* would in no sort otherwise<sup>f</sup> receive *Ibas*, unlesse he himselfe did condemne the impietie contained in that Epistle. Would any in the world (save *Baronius*, a man meerly infatuated in this cause, and such as follow his idle fancies) account that to bee a corruption or depravation of the Aets, which is the maine scope, purpose, judgement, and definition of the Synod? which they so often in their severall Sessions repeate, of which they expressely testifie in their very definitive sentence, that they before had said, proved, & demonstrated the same, without which also if it were taken away, (as the Cardinall pretends it should,) not onely the Aets should be utterly perverted, but the quite contrary to the judgement and determination of the Councell, should bee affirmed. *Baronius* might with as great truth and probability have said, that the handling of the *Three Chapters*, or judging of the *Three Chapters* had beene a depravation and corrupting of the Aets, for this assertion that *Ibas* his Epistle was condemned by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, is as necessarie and essentiall to the Aets, as the cause it selfe of the *Three Chapters*, or any sentence that is any where set downe therein.

2. But yet if it be no depravation in the Aets, yet, saith the Cardinall, and *Binius*, it is untrue, It is a lye, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* condemned that Epistle: Let falshood and impudency it selfe stand here amazed and agast at these men. This definitive sentence of

<sup>a</sup> Quod ibidem subditur, eandem Epistolam in Synodo Chalced. fuisse damnatam, ipsa acta fides docent, neutrum enim horum verum esse superius demonstravimus. Bar. an. 553. nu. 211.

<sup>b</sup> Duo aut plura mendacia. Bin. not. in Conc. 5. p. 605. b.

<sup>c</sup> Anathematizavit Epist. contrariam per omnia, exposita definitioni a Concilio Chalced. Sam. 2. Synodus dixit, Scimus et nos hac ita subsequens esse. Coll. 6. pa. 564. a. d. Coll. eadem. pa. 576. b. <sup>d</sup> Quod factum demonstratum est, contrariam per omnia Epistolam esse huic definitioni (Chalced.) continetur. Coll. 8. pa. 584. a. <sup>e</sup> Invenimus quod non aliter possunt Ibas suscipere, &c. 16.

<sup>g</sup> Loc. citat.

this Councell, wherein it is proclaimed and decreed, that the *Epistle* of *Ibas* was condemned by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, is approved by all succeeding generall Councells, by *Pelagius*, *Gregory*, and all other their successors, till *Leo* the tenth, (that is, by the consenting judgment of the whole Catholike Church, and of all Catholikes ever since that decree was made) and now *Baronius* and *Binus* stand up to give them all the lie; they all say untruths, onely *Baronius* and *Binus* are men that drop Oracles, out of whose mouths no lie nor untruth can at any time proceed.

h *Loco cit.*

3. But saith the Cardinall <sup>h</sup>, *The Acts of the Councell of Chalcedon doe declare this, and out of them I have before demonstrated this.* Loc, the Cardinall will not onely say it, but prove it, yea, he hath even demonstrated out of the Councell of *Chalcedon* all the former Popes, and Councells, that is, all the whole Catholike Church, to lye. I feare mee, such demonstrations will not turne to the Cardinals credit: Doe the Acts of the Councell teach or demonstrate that ? could none of the Popes ? none of the succeeding generall Councells spie it in those Acts, till *Baronius* took the all tardy in an untruth ? What will you say to the Cardinal and to his demonstration, if the Acts doe not reach this ? nay, if they teach directly and demonstrate the quite contrary, who then, I pray you, must have the whetstone ? the Catholike Church or the illustrious Cardinall ? And certainly the Acts of *Chalcedon* doe demonstrate what this fift Councell, and after it the sixt, seventh, and eighth, and the rest testifie, that this *Epistle* of *Ibas* was condemned by the Councell of *Chalcedon*. First, it is cleare and certaine by those Acts that the Councell of *Chalcedon* condemned *Nestorius*, and all the impious doctrines and blasphemies of *Nestorius*, approving the *Ephesine* <sup>i</sup> Councell, and the Synodall Epistle of *Cyrill*, wherein they <sup>k</sup> are condemned and anathematized: was not this a condemning of the Epistle of *Ibas*, which defendeth *Nestorius* and his heresies, which is full fraught with all his blasphemous doctrines ? Could the Councell of *Chalcedon* condemne and anathematize the doctrine of *Nestorius*, and yet not condemne that *Epistle* which defends all those doctrines ? By the Acts it is cleare and certaine, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* approve <sup>l</sup> their owne decree of faith: now this *Epistle*, as not onely the fift Councell often <sup>m</sup>, but after it Pope *Gregory* saith, *procul dubio definitioni Synodi probatur adversa, without doubt is contrary to the definition of the Councell of Chalcedon*. Is not the approving of their definition a rejecting and condemning of whatsoever writing is contrary to the same ? By the Acts it is cleare and certaine, that the Councell even in their definition <sup>o</sup> forbids, and pronounceth it unlawfull for any to teach, or produce, or write, or deliuer any other doctrine, which whosoever doth, if hee bee a Bishop or Clerke, hee shall bee deposed; if a Monke or Lay man, anathematized: Is not this a plaine forbidding of that Epistle to bee read, or taught, the doctrine whereof is directly contrary to their decree ? when by the Councels decree it may neither be taught, written, nor read, (otherwise then with a detestation) is not this a condemning of it by the Councell ? by the Acts that is cleare in the fift Councell <sup>p</sup>, that the Councell of

*Chalcedon*

i S. et magna Synodus s. Cyrilli Synodales Epistolas amplectitur, ad arguendum Nestorianam dementiam, &c. Conc. Chalcedon. Act. 5. pa. 96. et Can. 1. pa. 15.  
k Omnes Episcopi clamaverunt, Quicumque Nestorianus anathematizatur, anathema sit. Omnes Nestorij Epistolam, et dogmata anathematizamus. Conc. Ephes. 10. 2. ca. 4. pa. 743.  
l Hinc omnes confestimur, omnes ita sapienter Act. 5. pa. 98.  
m Epistolam definitio S. Chalcedonensis Concilij condemnavit. Collat. 6. pa. 576 & et alibi.  
n Lib. 7. Ind. 2. Epist. 54.  
o Cbal. Conc. Act. 5. pa. 38.  
p Hoc iudicium Photij et Eustathij omnes Episcopi (Cbal. Conc.) sequuntur, perscrutarunt ipsum (Ibas) anathematizavit Nestorium et impia ejus dogmata. Can. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 563. b.




Chalcedon approved the judgement of *Photinus* and *Eustathius*, for as *Photinus* and *Eustathius*, so they all at <sup>a</sup> Chalcedon required *Ibas* to anathematize *Nestorius* and his doctrines, before they would receive him. Now as the fifth Councell truly saith, to approve the judgement of *Photinus* and *Eustathius*, *Nihil est aliud quam condemnare impiam Epistolam; this is nothing else than to condemne the impious Epistle*, seeing in it *Nestorius* and his heresies are defended. To be short (for there are very many other evidences to declare this,) Pope *Gregory* testifieth, that the fifth Councell was *in omnibus sequax, did in all things follow the Councell of Chalcedon*; if in all, then in condemning this impious *Epistle*, and if they followed it therein, then most certainly the Councell of Chalcedon condemned it before them. So untrue it is which the Cardinall saith, that the Acts doe shew, and that out of them he hath demonstrated, that the Councell of Chalcedon did not condemne this *Epistle*, whereas he hath demonstrated nothing so cleare, as himselfe to bee a malicious and shamelesse downfacer of most certaine and evident truths. Thus much of his first sort of *corruptions*, namely, the *three variations* or depravations, wherewith, as you see, hee hath slandered the Acts of this fifth Councell, to his immortall disgrace.

q Ibam anathematizantem Nestorium et eius impia dogmata, permanere in Sacerdotio volo. Euseb. E. pif. Ancyra in Conc. chal. Act. 10. pa. 115. sic Stephanus, Romanus, Eutimius et omnes Episcopi clamaverunt: omnes eadem dicimus. Ibid. pa. 126. a. r Coll. 6. p. 563. b f Loco citato.

## CAP. XXVIII.

The three first defects in the Synodall Acts, pretended by *Baronius*, for that the Acts against the *Origenists*, the *Edict of Iustinian*, and his *Epistle* touching that cause, are wanting therein, refuted.

1.  HE second kinde of the Cardinals Heteroclitites, are his *defectives*: And here he and *Binius* labour to prove the lameness and defects of these Acts by five instances: The first of them concernes the proceeding against *Origen*, and the *Origenists*, which was done in the fifth Synod, but is now wanting in the Acts thereof. Let us first heare what *Binius* saith hereof;

The curtaling and maiming of these Acts doethose fragments declare which we have added to the end of the Synod, quodque nulla vel levis tantum mentio reperiatur de condemnatis erroribus Origenis; and because there is no mention, nor any small, or light mention, found in them, touching the errors of *Origen* condemned. If one were disposed to quit *Binius* with his owne uncivill words, *Binius* should here be proclaimed both for a most impudent liar, and a shamelesse belyar of these Synodall Acts, of this holy Councell. There is expresse mention of condemning *Origen* in the fifth Collation, *Origen* was anathematized after his death in the time of *Theophilus Bishop of Alexandria*, which also your sanctitie, (hee speakes to the Bishops of this Synod) and *Vigilius Pope of Rome* have now done. Again, there is expresse mention of him, and his errors in the eighth collation in the very Synodall and definitive sentence of the Councell, where-

a Intelligas quod plurima in eadem Synodo desiderari. Bar. an. 553 nu. 243.

b Decurtatione et mutilationem Actuum indicant illa fragmenta quae in fine huius Synodi subiungi curavimus. Bini. not. in Conc. 5. § Constitutum.

c Coll. 5. pa. 552.

in Origen and his impious writings are condemned; for thus it is written <sup>c</sup>, If any man doe not accurse Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris, Nestorius, Eutyches, Origen, cum impijs eorum conscriptis, with their impious writings, and all other heretikes condemned by the Catholike Church, let that man bee accursed. When the holy Councell not onely mentions the condemning of Origen, but by their judicall sentence themselves also condemne, both him, his errors, and his impious writings; what a face of Adamant had Binus, against the truth, against his owne text of the Councell, against his conscience and knowledge to say, there is no mention, no not any *levis mentio*; to be found in the Acts of the errors of Origen condemned? or if Binus will not be persuaded of his untruth, for us, let him acknowledge it for his Master Baronius his credit, who saith <sup>d</sup>, In these Synodall Acts there is made onely, *brevis mentio de Origine ejusque erroribus condemnatis*, a short mention in the eleventh anathematisme of Origen, and his errors condemned: if there bee *brevis mentio* of him and his errors, then Binus must cry the Acts forgivenesse, for saying there is no mention at all, no not *levis mentio*, of his errors.

<sup>d</sup> An. 553. nu. 238.

<sup>e</sup> An. 553. nu. 238.

<sup>f</sup> An. eod. nu. 242. porro de Origine, ad id esse in Synodo positum, inde vero de Theodoro. &c. g. Ceterum et illas putamus esse his (actis de Origine) subjectas litteras Imperatoris ad Memnam Origenis errores contin. nics. Bar. an. eod. 553. nu. 242.

<sup>h</sup> Fuisse eandem Epistolam (quam Cedrenus recitat) ad Synodum datam actis ejus intextam, nemo jure dubitavit ut ex his intelligas quam plurima desiderari. Bar. an. eod. nu. 243. i. An. eod. nu. 238.

<sup>k</sup> Niceph. Col. list. lib. 17. Eccl. Hist. 62. 27.

2. Let us see now if Baronius deale any better. *Constat*, saith <sup>e</sup> hee, It is manifest by the testification of many, that Origen, Didimus, and Evagrius, together with their errors were condemned in this fift Synod, and that there was written, at least recited & repeated against them those ten Anathematismes which Nicephorus setteth downe; but in the Acts there is onely a briefe mention that Origen and his errors were condemned. Baronius adds one speciall point further out of Cedrenus, that in this fitt Councell, first <sup>f</sup>, they handled the cause against Origen, and then against the Three Chapters: So by the Cardinals profession there wants the whole first action in these Acts of this Synod, which, it may be, had many Sessions, as the other Action about the three Chapters: Besides this, there wants also, saith hee <sup>g</sup>, the letters or Edict published by Iustinian: Thirdly, there wants <sup>h</sup>, the Epistle of Iustinian, sent to the Synod about the condemning of Origen, which is set downe by Cedrenus, out of whom both Baronius reciteth it, and Binus adjoyns it at the end of the Acts among the fragments which are wanting in these Acts. These three defects touching the cause of Origen doth the Cardinall alleage. <sup>i</sup>

3. But in very deed none of these three, nor ought else, which Baronius mentioneth, argue any defect at all in these Acts, but they evidently demonstrate in the Card. a maine defect of judgement, and an overflowing superabundance of malice against this holy Synod, and these true Acts thereof. That the cause of Origen was not, as hee supposeth, the first Action, or the first cause handled by the Synod; I might alleage the most cleare testimony of his owne witnesse Nicephorus, who after the narration of the three Chapters, and the Synodall sentence touching them delivered, which he accounts for the first Session of the Synod, addeth <sup>k</sup>, In secunda autem Sessione, but in the second Session, the Libels against the impious doctrines of Origen were offered & read, and Iustinian, rursum Synodum de eis sententia ferre jussit, commanded againe the Synod to give sentence in that cause. So Nicephorus: whereby it is evident that the Cardinal and his Cedrenus are foully deceived in saying, that

that the cause of *Origen* was first handled by the Synod; and after that the cause of the *Three Chapters*: but I oppose to these, farre greater and even authentike records, the *Epistle* of the Emperour<sup>1</sup> to the Synod, who, at the beginning and first meeting of the Bishops in the Councell, proposed to their handling the cause of the *Three Chapters*, and no other at all; commanding them without delay to discusse and give their judgement in that: I oppose the *definition* and Synodall decree<sup>m</sup>, wherein is set downe their whole proceeding, and what they handled almost every day of their meeting, from the beginning to the ending; so that it alone is as a *Thesaur* thred, which wil not permit a man to erre in this cause, unlesse he maliciously shut his eyes against the truth, and wilfully depart out of that plaine path. They<sup>n</sup> came to the Synod to decide the controversie then moved about the *Three Chapters*, at the command of the Emperour; before they entred to the handling thereof, they often intreated by their messengers, Pope *Vigilius* to come together with them; (which was all that they did in the first<sup>o</sup> & second<sup>p</sup> day of their meeting or Collation) when *Vigilius* would not come; then by the Apostles admonition, they prepared themselves to the handling of the cause proposed, by setting downe a confession of their faith, consonant to the foure former Councils, and exposition of the Fathers, and promising in their next meeting to handle the cause of the *Three Chapters*, which was the summe of the third<sup>a</sup> dayes Collation: *Cumque*<sup>t</sup> ita confessi simus; initium fecimus examinationis trium Capitulorum; and when wee had made this confession, wee began the examination of the *Three Chapters*; loe, they did *initium sumere*, they began with this. Could they speak more plainly, that the cause of *Origen* was not first handled? as if prophetically they meant to refute this untruth of *Baronius* and *Cedrenus*; and wee first discussed the cause of *Theodorus Mopsuestenus* out of his owne writing there read before us: This was all they did the fourth<sup>t</sup>, and a great part of the fifth<sup>t</sup> day of their Collatiō. *His de Theodoro discussis, pauca de Theodoro*; next after the discussing of the Chapter touching *Theodorus*, wee caused a few things to bee repeated out of the impious writings of *Theodoret*; for the satisfying of the reader; and this they did in the end of the fifth day or Collation. *Tertio loco Epistola quam Ibas*, &c; In the third place we proposed, and examined the *Epistle* of *Ibas*: and this they did at large; and it was all they did in the sixth<sup>a</sup> day of their Collation. The whole cause being thus, and, as the Councell confesseth, most diligently and sufficiently examined, the Councell (as it seemeth by their owne words in the end of the sixth Collation) intended to proceed to sentence in the next day of their meeting: but before ought was done therein, the Emperour sent unto the Synod certaine letters of *Vigilius*, testifying his condemning of those *Three Chapters*, and some other writings, the reading of the is all was done in the seventh<sup>a</sup> day of their Collation. Now for that the cause was sufficiently examined before, and these letters were read onely for a further evidence, but not for necessity of the cause, and for that the Synod did nothing themselves, but onely heard the letters, and applauded the Emperours zeale and care for the truth, therefore it is that this seventh Collation; and what was done

1 Extat Conc. 5.  
Coll. 1.

m Collat. 8.

n Pro Dei voluntate & iustitiae pessimi Imperatoris convenerimus. Ibid.

o 1. Coll. 4. die May.  
p 2. Coll. 3. die May.

q 3. Coll. 9. die May.  
r Loc. cit. Coll. 3. p. 534.

s Coll. 4. 11. die May.  
t Coll. 5. 14. die May. pridie Idus May. Bar. an. 553. nu. 41.

u 6. Coll. 19. May.

x 7. Coll. 26. die May.



y 8. Coll. 2. die  
annj.

done therein is omitted in the Synodall sentence; and the Councell which on that seventh day had made ready and intended to have pronounced their sentence; by this occasion deferred it to the next, which was the eighth day of their Collation, using these for the last words of their seventh dayes meeting, *De tribus capitulis altero die adiuvante Deo Synodicam sententiam proferemus*; God willing wee will pronounce our Synodall sentence touching this cause of the three Chapters the next day. And so they did in that eighth, which was their last day of Collation. Thus not onely by Nicephorus and the Emperours Epistle, but by the evident testimony of the whole Synod in the Synodall sentence, it is undoubtedly certaine that the cause of Origen was not as he fancieth the first action or cause handled in the Synod, and that he doth but play the Mome in carping at the Acts for want of the first Action.

z Loco citato.  
\* Evag. lib. 4.  
ca. 37.

a Coll. 8. p. 586. a

b Niceph. et  
Evag. loc. citat.

4. It may bee yet that the cause of Origen was the second action in the fift Synod, as Nicephorus<sup>a</sup> saith, and after him Evagrius<sup>\*</sup>, and that is enough to prove the defects of these Acts. No, it was not the second neither; as it was not before, so neither was it handled after the other of the *Three Chapters*, witness the Synodall sentence it selfe, wherein all the matters which every day they examined and discussed are set downe and repeated; after repetition they testifie<sup>a</sup> also, *Repetitis igitur omnibus, quae apud nos acta sunt*, all things being repeated which were done or handled by way of discussion among us, or in this Synod. Seeing they repeated all that was debated among them, and make no mention of this cause of Origen, it is undoubtedly certaine that Origen's cause was not debated either first or last in the Synod; it was neither the first action, as Cedrenus and Baronius, nor the second, as Evagrius and Nicephorus suppose; besides the very determination of the Synod, evidently declares the errors of Nicephorus and Evagrius: The books, say they<sup>b</sup>, against the doctrine of Origen being offered to the Synod, the Emperour demanded of the Councell, *Quid de his statueret*, What it would decree concerning those doctrines? A matter utterly incoherent and improbable; for in the synodall decree concerning the *three Chapters*, which they suppose to be made before this cause of Origen was either heard or proposed, the Councell had expressly delivered their judgement, and condemned both Origen and his impious writings. When they had already condemned both him and his errors, what an incongruity is it to make the Emperour demand, what they would decree of him and his errors? Or may we thinke that the holy Synod would first condemne Origen, and his impious writings as they did, in the synodall sentence against the *three Chapters*, and then afterwards examine the matter, and make an enquiry whether Origen and his writings were to bee condemned or not? which were to follow that disorder which the Switzers are reported to have used in judgement, (which was most justly called *Iudicium vetitum*) to execute a man, and then try and examine whether he ought to be executed or not. Farre be it from any to imagine such injustice and rashnesse to have beene in this holy generall Councell. Seeing then they condemned and accursed Origen and all his errors, in that which Nicephorus and Evagrius account the former Session, it is ridiculous to think that either the Em-

perour

perour urged, or that they themselves would in the second Session goe Switzer-like to examine the bookes and doctrines of *Origen*, whether he & they ought to be condemned. Some doubt perhaps may arise out of those words in the Councell<sup>d</sup>, which the Cardinall flily<sup>e</sup> alledgeth, *Origen* was condemned in the time of *Theophilus*, *Quod etiam nunc in ipsa fecit vestra Sanctitas*, which your Holinesse hath now done, and Pope *Vigilius* also. But if the words be marked, they make nothing against that which I have said: for neither hath that [*Nunc*] a relation to this present Councell, (for it is certaine that in it *Vigilius* did not condemn *Origen*, seeing he was not at all present in the Synod,) but to this age; he was condemned in former ages, as namely by *Theophilus*, and now also, that is, in this your age, and even by your selves, and by *Vigilius*: and if ought else were imported thereby, yet is it onely said that *Origen* was now condemned: which was indeed done by the Synod: but that his cause was then examined and debated there, neither is it true, neither doe the words any way imply.

5. Nay I adde further, not onely that this Councell did not debate this cause of *Origen*, but it had beene both superfluous, and an open wrong to themselves, and to the whole Church, to have entred into the examination thereof. For beside many other former judgements, not many<sup>e</sup> yeares before in the time of *Mennas*, both the Emperour in an Imperiall Edict<sup>f</sup> had condemned *Origen* and his errors; and by the Emperours command, *Mennas* with a Synod of Bishops then present at *Constantinople*, had confirmed that condemnation; the other Bishops who were absent did the like, the Emperour requiring every Patriarke to cause all the Bishops subject to his jurisdiction, to subscribe to the same. The doctrines and writings of *Origen* were no doubt at that time fully debated; all the Bishops present in this fift Councell had then subscribed and consented to the condemnation of him and his errors; so had *Vigilius* and all Catholike Bishops in the West. Seeing the judgement of the Church in condemning *Origen* was universall, would the Councell, after themselves, and all other Catholike Bishops, that is, after the judgement of the whole Catholike Church, now debate and examine whether *Origen* and his doctrines ought to be condemned? They might as well call into question whether *Arius*, or *Macedonius*, or *Nestorius*, or *Eutyches*, and their doctrine should bee condemned: the judgement of the Catholike Church was alike passed on them all: for this Councell<sup>g</sup> condemned and accursed *Origen* and his errors, as it did *Arius*, *Macedonius*, *Nestorius*, and *Eutyches*, but it condemned them all upon the knowne judgement of the Catholike Church, not upon a new tryall or examination then taken of any one of them. And this verily seemes to have deceived and led into error *Evagrius*, *Nicephorus*, and *Cedrenus*, (for of *Baronius* I cannot for many reasons imagine it to have beene error or ignorance in him, but wilfull and malicious oppugning the truth,) they knew or heard by report, (for even *Evagrius*<sup>h</sup>, who lived in that age, saith of that which hee writeth touching the fift Synod, Of these things sic actum accepimus, we have heard they were thus done,) I say, they might heare (that which indeed was true) that *Origen* and his errors

were

d Coll. 5. p. 552. a  
e An. 553. un. 42  
hec acta inquit  
desiderantur in  
Synodis ecc.

e Anno nemp̃ 12  
Iustiniani, &  
Vigili 2. ut no-  
tat Bar. an. 538.  
nu. 29. et 31.  
f Extat Edict:  
10. 2. Conc. p. 4  
482. et seq.

g coll. 8. p. 367

h Evag. loc. cit.

Extant post  
edictum Justin.  
pa. 488.

were condemned in a Councell at *Constantinople* in the time of *Iustinian*; and they not being curious, nor carefull to sift the diversities of Councils, nor exact in computing times; confounded the former particular Synod under *Mennas*; wherein many of the doctrines of *Origen* were recited, and he with them condemned in eleven Anathematismes<sup>i</sup>; with this sift generall Synod, held some fourteene years after, wherein *Origen* and his errors were also condemned, but neither the Emperours *Edict* read, nor the cause of *Origen* debated, nor the particulars recited as they were in the former. Further, it is most likely that together with divers copies of the sift Councell were annexed the Acts of that former under *Mennas*, that so men might see what were the particular heresies condemned in *Origen*, wherein some according to the order of time might set them before these, and others according to the order of dignity might set them after the acts of this sift Councell; which might occasion some with *Cedrenus* to thinke them a former, some with *Nicephorus* to thinke them a second action of this sift Councell, whereas in truth they were the acts of a severall and provincially Councell by themselves, and neither the first nor last, nor any acts at all of this generall Councell.

6. By this now I suppose every one doth see the weaknesse of the Baronian frame, touching the anathematismes and proceeding against *Origen*. They are not extant among the acts of the sift Synod. True: nor were they ever, nor ought they to bee inserted or set among the true Acts thereof: these anathematismes neither were made nor repeated in the Councell. The *Edict* of *Iustinian* for the condemning of *Origen* is not there neither. True, neither ought it to bee; it was never sent to, never published in this sift Councell: but if in any, in that provincially Synod under *Mennas*, unto which it was sent; and the Cardinall to prove that *Edict* to have beene a part of these Acts, brings no other, nor better proofe than his owne [*putamus* <sup>k</sup>], a proofe so exceeding weake, that it is not worthy a refutation. The Epistle of *Iustinian* sent to the Synod commanding them to condemne *Origen*, which is one of the fragments that *Binius*<sup>l</sup> hath added, is not among the Acts. True, nor ought it to be; for neither is it *Iustinian*s, but an extract and brieve collection of *Cedrenus*, who out of the large *Edict* or Epistle, (as the Emperour calleth it) collected this; neither doth it any way belong to this, but to the former Synod. The condemnation of *Didymus* and *Evagrius*, saith *Binius*<sup>m</sup>, together with *Origen*, was made in this sift Synod, as the second Nicene Councell<sup>n</sup> witnesseth, and that is not here among the Acts. That *Didymus* and *Evagrius* were nominatim condemned in the sift Synod, the second Nicene Councell sayth it not; no, if one would straitly stand upon it, they do not say so much as that<sup>o</sup> they were at all, but that their doctrines touching preexistence were condemned. But say they sayd it; *Didymus* and *Evagrius* were two earnest Origenists<sup>p</sup>, and defenders of *Origen*s error. Now the sift Councell not onely condemneth *Origen* and his errors, sed eos qui similia prae dictis hereticis sapuerunt, vel sapiunt; but all who teach or thinke the like that *Origen* did: in which generality *Didymus* and *Evagrius*, and all Origenists are condemned; which generall

k an. 953. n. 242.  
l Post Conc. 5.  
pa. 604. et pa.  
606. b. indicant  
illa fragmenta,  
etc.  
m lb. pa. 606. b.  
n Act. 1. pa.  
306. a.  
o Communi et  
generali anathe-  
mate vi effecti  
sunt Origenes,  
et Theodorus  
Mopsuestenus,  
et quaecumq; ab  
Evagrion et Di-  
dymo dicta sunt  
de praesentia.  
Conc. Nic. 2.  
loco citat.  
p Didymus et  
Evagrius secta-  
rii Origenis. Bi. 2.  
loc. citat.



condemnation is all that can be enforced out of the second Nicene Synod. Thus all the three defects which *Baronius* and *Binius* labour to prove in these Acts about this cause of *Origen*, declare a foule maime in their owne wits and judgements, but none in the Acts; and doe evidently shew, that themselves under colour of correcting these acts, doe indeed corrupt and falsifie the same.

7. And yet (which one can scarce with patience endure, or read without scorne of their folly) they are not content to tell what is stoln or taken away touching this cause of *Origen* out of these acts; but like skilfull figure-fingers, they will name you the very thiefe, and tell particularly who maimed the Acts in this part. And who thinke you is it? Even *Theodorus* a Bish. op of *Caesarea*; they have an implacable hatred to him; he is an Origenist, he the chiefe of the Origenists; and for love of *Origen* hee corrupted the acts of this fift Synod, and stole away the proceedings against *Origen*, the Anathematismes, the *Edict*, and *Epistle* of *Iustinian*. O how blinde and besotted is a malicious minde: that is it which put this rare skill of divination into the heart of *Baronius* and *Binius*. There is nothing stolne; as these Acts doe demonstrate, and yet they will tell you who took away the goods. They doe with *Theodorus* as the malicious *Arians* dealt with *Athanasius*, proclaimed him for a murderer, and conjurer, and little lesse than condemned him for killing *Arsenius*, and cutting off his right hand, which they brought into the open Court; whereas *Arsenius* was both alive, and a sound man with both his hands: So this viperous Arian brood proclame *Theodorus* for cutting off one arme of these Acts, which yet hath no maime nor defect at all in that part. *Theodorus* was a Catholike Bishop, a condemner and anathematizer of *Origen* and all his errors, and yet they will enforce you to beleewe that he is an heretike, an Origenist, the chiefe patron of the Origenists. Yet these men have not very well summed up their accounts: For how did *Theodorus* take away that which was against the Origenists, whereas hee suffered to stay in the Acts an anathema to *Origen*, and to the impious writings of *Origen*, and to all that thinke as did *Origen*, yea to all that doe not anathematize *Origen*? What fillinesse was it in the Cardinall, to thinke that *Theodorus* or any Origenist would spoyle the Acts, and take away some discourses, and disputations against *Origen*, and leave that which is the maine matter of all, the sentence of condemnation against him, and his errors, yea against themselves, (supposing them to be such as the Cardinall slandereth them) and that also subscribed by their owne hands, as an eternall witnesse against them? So maliciously blinded were the Cardinall and *Binius* in this cause, that so they spake against the Councell and the Catholike Bishops thereof, they regard not how untruly, how unadvisedly they slander them. But neither is it a disgrace to *Theodorus* to suffer like slander as did *Athanasius*, nor is it any honour to the Cardinall and *Binius* to slander, and doe the like as their forefathers the old *Arians* have done before them. And thus much of the three first defects in these Acts, which all concerne the cause of *Origen*.

q. Quis dubitet  
id factū ab Ori-  
genistis qui Sy-  
nodo praesuerūt,  
quorum patronus  
fuit Theodorus  
malorum omniū  
concinuator, Bar.  
an. 553. m. 244.  
& intelligere po-  
tes quorum arte  
quae in Synodo  
acta sunt contra  
Origenem &  
ejus ex ea fuerint de-  
curtata. ibid.  
Quis neget The-  
odorum Caesari-  
ensem abstulisse  
ab actis hujus  
Concilij quae suae  
causae erat anti-  
Origenistarum  
patronus ad ver-  
santur. Bin.  
Notis in Conc.  
5. p. 606. b.  
r. Russ. lib. 1.  
Ecc. hist. ca. 17.  
& alij.

## CAP. XXIX.

*The fourth defect in the Synodall Acts pretended by Baronius, for that the Emperors Epistle to the fift Councell is wanting therein, refused.*

<sup>a</sup> *Epistola 2. Justin. ad Conc. Oecumenicum.*  
<sup>5.</sup> *Bin. pa. 604. b.*  
<sup>b</sup> *An. 553. nu. 243.*



<sup>1.</sup> **I**H E fourth defect which they finde in these Acts, is the want of that other *Epistle of Iustinian* directed to the Synod, set downe by *Cedrenus*, and out of him annexed by *Binus* to the end of the Synod, as one of the fragments which were taken away from the Acts. Of it *Baronius* <sup>b</sup> thus writeth: *Cedrenus adjoyneth after this another Epistle of the Emperor sent to the*

*Synod, containing an history of the four generall Councils, in the end whereof divers things are written against Theodorus of Mopsuestia; the beginning of it is this, Majores nostri fidei cultores, &c. That this same Epistle sent to the Synod was inserted among the Acts thereof, nemo jure dubitavit, none may justly doubt: so that by this you may perceive, Quam plurima in eadem quinta Synodo desiderari, that very many things are wanting in the Acts of this fift Councell. Thus Baronius. No sure: that cannot be hence perceived: but another thing is most evident, that the Cardinall is more malicious in carping at these Acts, and correcting Magnificat, than Momus himselfe. May no man doubt but that this Epistle of Iustinian (as it is set downe by Cedrenus) was inserted in the Acts of this fift Councell? what prooffe hath the Cardinall for this his confident saying? Truly none at all: nor could hee finde any sound prooffe, if he had studied for one thirty yeares: for none but a carping Momus can, and none at all ought to doubt of the contrary, that this Epistle which is in Cedrenus, neither was Iustinians Epistle, neither was sent unto the Synod. Iustinian indeed sent a very large and learned Epistle to the Bishops of the Synod at their first assembling, containing altogether the like effect, (to wit, a history or narration of the foure former Councils, and a declaration of the impieties both of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and of the writing of Theodoret, and of the impious Epistle of Ibas :) by which he commanded and authorized the Synod to examine and decide that controversie touching the three Chapters; and that being the true and authentickall Epistle of Iustinian, is extant in the Acts <sup>c</sup>, and is the warrant for all that the Synod did. That which out of Cedrenus the Cardinall and Binus mention, is nothing else (as any man may easily see) but an epitome or extract which Cedrenus himselfe, or some other undiscreeit abridger, collected out of the true Epistle of Iustinian. It is not the use of Emperours to send with their letters abridgements and briefes of the same, especially such (of which sort this is) as come farre short of the maine scope of the same. Besides, if there were nothing else, yet the untruths which the abbreviator sets down, and that quite contrary to the mind of Iustinian, may testifie, it was neither writ, nor sent by him to the Synod. In that Baronian Epistle Eutyches is sayd <sup>d</sup> to approve the opinions*

<sup>c</sup> *Collat. 1. pa. 518. & sequ.*

<sup>d</sup> *Eutyches Nestoris opiniones probat in Frag. ex Cedr. apud Bin. pa. 605. b.*

opinions of *Nestorius*; whereas the heresie of *Eutyches* was quite contrary to that of *Nestorius*, as *Iustinian*<sup>i</sup> truly observeth in his *Epistle*; for *Nestorius* taught two<sup>k</sup> natures to be in *Christ*, and to make two persons; *Eutyches* taught as but one person, so but one<sup>l</sup> nature. Yea the Eutychians utterly condemned the Nestorians, and with them all Catholikes, as Nestorians, because<sup>m</sup> they taught 2. natures after the adunation to remain in *Christ*,<sup>n</sup> *Qui dicit duas naturas, Nestorianus est*. In that Baronian *Epistle* *Eutyches* is affirmed to follow *Nestorius*, in that<sup>o</sup> he said that the flesh of *Christ* and ours are not of one nature, but *Nestorius* taught no such thing, but the clean contrary<sup>p</sup>, the flesh which *Christ* took of the blessed *Virgin* to be truly humane, and therefore the sonne of *Mary* to be truly, but yet onely a man; as *Iustinian* also in his *Epistle* teacheth. In that Baronian *Epistle*, *Nestorius* is sayd<sup>q</sup> to have beene the master or teacher of *Theodorus*; but the quite contrary is truth, as both the whole fift<sup>r</sup> Councell often, and even in their definitive sentence, and *Iustinian*<sup>r</sup> in his *Epistle* doe expressly witnesse. Are not *Baronius* and *Binius* rare men to cure the lameness of Councils, who when the *Acts* are found and perfect, would patch unto them such false and unworthy writings, containing so manifest untruths, repugnant to the authentick records of the *Acts*? But woe come to all Councils, Fathers, and ancient writings, when they must be amended and cured by such Surgeons as *Baronius* and *Binius*. Give me the most iame and impotent Councils that can be had, I had rather have them all to be creeples, than to come under their deadly, unfortunate, and Harpyan hands, which defile every history or writing that they touch.

<sup>m</sup> Exclamaverunt, de vicina Nestoriana heresi infamantes nos, In duo sepeate, interficite eos qui dicunt duas naturas, de Eutychianis loquitur, Conc. Chal. Act. 1. p. 3. a. <sup>n</sup> Eum qui dicit duas naturas in duo incidite. Qui dicit duas naturas, Nestorianus est. ibid. p. 12. a. <sup>o</sup> Eutyches Nestorii opiniones probans, dicensq. carnem Christi non ejusdem cum nostra esse naturam, Epist. ex Cedr. p. 65. b. <sup>p</sup> Ut liquet ex verbis Nestorii, ante citatis. <sup>q</sup> Opera Theodori Mopsuesteni, qui magistrum suum Nestorium impie de rebus sacris loquendo superabat. Epist. ex Cedr. loc. cit. <sup>r</sup> Et docerent non solum discipulum impietatis Nestorium, sed etiam doctorem ejus Theodorum. Coll. 8. p. 585. b. <sup>s</sup> Per Theodorum Mopsuestenum; doctorem Nestorii. Epist. Iust. Coll. 1. p. 519.

i Nestorio alium dicente Deum verbum, et alium Christum, &c. Iust. epist. coll. 1. p. 519. k Jnes te laudo quod distinctio nem naturarum secundum divinitatem et humanitatem rationem predicat. Hac enim vera et orthodoxa sunt, &c. Sic Nestorius scribit Cyrillo, in ea Epist. Nest. que habetur. tom. 1. Ephes. Conc. 1. q. 1 Eutyches negat consubstantialitatem nobis esse carnem Domini. Iust. in Epist. ad Synod. sup. citat. et anathem. qui dicit duas naturas post adunationem, dicitur Eutychiani in conciliab. Eph. apud Conc. Chal. Act. 1.

## CAP. XXX.

The first defect in the Synodall Acts pretended by *Baronius*, for that the Constitution of Pope *Vigilius* concerning the three Chapters is wanting therein, refused.

**T**He first defect which the Cardinall hath spied in these Acts, is, that the Constitution of Pope *Vigilius* is not now extant therein. Of it the Cardinall sayth<sup>a</sup>, That it belongeth to the Acts of the first Synod, is evidently declared by that which we have spoken: and againe, this<sup>b</sup> Constitution

as also many other things, *Noscitur esse sublatum*, is knowne to be taken out of the Acts of the first Synod. How prove you Sir, that either it belongs to it, or is taken out of these Synodall acts? What? againe so rude and unmannerly as aske a reason of the Car-



dinall? Is it not proved sufficiently when *Baronius* hath sayd it? Truly then it is disproved sufficiently when an opposer of *Baronius* hath denyed it. For any man for truth and credit may easily oversway *Baronius*. I pray, why should the Popes Constitution bee part of the Acts, rather than the Emperours Edicts? or why doth the Cardinall finde a defect in wanting the Papall, which is *hereticall*, and not of the Imperiall which is an *orthodoxall* decree?

2. *Baronius* will further tell you, out of which part of the Acts this is stolne. It was offered to the Synod in their fift Collation, *Ad hunc ipsum diem quinta Collationis pertinere cognoscitur*; It is knowne that the Popes Constitution belongs to this yeare, and to this very day of the fift Collation. And how I pray you is that knowne? Because the Constitution hath in the end of it the date of the day and yeare wherein *Vigilius* published it. A reason fit for none but a Cardinall. As it all Constitutions, Letters, and Edicts which beare date of a yeare and a day, belonged to that fift Collation, and were certainly stolne out of it. Was ever any infatuated, if not *Baronius* in this cause? But the Constitution beares date on the 14. day of May, in the reigne of *Iustinus*, and the fift Collation of the Synod was on the same day. A like reason to the former: as if all Letters or Constitutions written on that day must needs be published in the Councell, or on that very day in their Collation. Admitting it was read, yet the contrary seemes much rather to follow, that it was not read on that day, but on some other after; for the Constitution is directed *z*, and was sent *h* to the Emperour: that could not be before the fourteenth day, on which it is dated, and in likelihood the Emperour both read and examined it with leasure before he sent it from him to the Councell: the length of the Constitution may easily perswade any, that one day was little enough for that businesse, supposing no other affaires to have distracted the Emperour. *Binius* considering this, and being better advised hereof, dissenting from the Cardinall herein, telsus that the Constitution was read in their sixt Collation, which was on the nineteenth *k* of May, foure or five dayes after the date and publishing of it. So uncertaine and unlikely is that, of which the Cardinall sayth *Cognoscitur*, it is knowne to belong to the fift Collation.

3. But indeed, as the Imperiall Edict was not, so neither was this Papal Constitution publicly read, either in the fift or sixt, or any other Collation of this Synod, much lesse was it ever any part of the Synodall Acts thereof. The Emperour, and so all the Bishops of the Synod laboured, as much as they could, to draw the whole Church to unity of faith with themselves, especially Pope *Vigilius*, whose consent might happily draw after it, if not the whole, yet a great part of the *Welterne* Church, which were most earnest in defence of the *Three Chapters*. They knew that in particular, and by name to condemn *Vigilius*, or his Constitution, might not only have exasperated, but even utterly alienated the minde of *Vigilius*, and made him (and with him his adherents) more obstinate in their heresie. They sought by silence to conceale and by charity to suppress, as much as they could, that hereticall and disgracefull Constitution of his, and by their

*c* Libellus Synodoblati pridie Idus May. an. 553. nu. 41. et Papa libellus oblati Synodo: nos hic (in 5. Collatione) suo loco restituendum esse putamus. ibid. nu. 47. d. Ibid. nu. 48. e. Ibid. f. Pridie Idus May. Bar. an. 553. nu. 310. eo autem die habita 5. Collatio. an. eodem nu. 41. g. Gloriosissimo et clementissimo filio Iustiniano, Vigilius Episcopus; ita incipit Constit. Vigil. apud Bar. an. 553. nu. 50. h. Vigilius pollicis fuisse misurum (decretum suum seu Constitutionem) ad ipsum Imperatorem atq. ad Synodum, quod et ingenue pressit. Bar. an. eodem nu. 47. i. Oblatum fuisse Concilio, Vigili Constitutionem, &c. quibus non obscure significatur idem Constitutionem in sexto illo Patrum consessu recitatum fuisse. Bini. Not. ad Conc. 5. pa. 610. a. et Ex Actis Concilii non obscure colligitur ipsam (Constitutionem) in sexto Consessu Episcoporum recitatum fuisse. idem pa. 606. b. k. 14. Kalendas Junias. Coll. 6. in initio.

lenity

lenity and faire meanes, to gaine him, and his consent to them, yea, even to the truth it selfe: for this cause, though they knew full well, that *Vigilius* had set out that decree, yea, though they confuted all the substance thereof, and condemned both it, and him in generalities, yet they forbore at all to name *Vigilius*, or in particular to mention this his decree, that had beene to proclame hostility, and have made an absolute breach betwixt them and *Vigilius* for ever.

4. Besides this, which was a very just reason, not so much as to publish (as they did not) that Constitution in their Synod, the Emperour had alwayes a purpose to have (as in the seventh Collation was done) the Epistles of *Vigilius* to *Rufinus* and *Sebastianus* to *Valentinianus* and others, openly read & published in the Councell: In them *Vigilius* by his Apostolicall authority decreeth the condemning of the three Chapters: what a disgrace had this beene to *Vigilius* to publish first his Apostolicall Constitution in defence, and shortly after, his Apostolicall Constitution for condemning the same Three Chapters? How justly might this have incensed *Vigilius*, and for ever withheld him from consenting to them, who had proclaimed him in their Councell, & recorded him in their Synodall Acts to bee such a *Protector*? Nay, this had extenuated and vilified for ever the authority of Pope *Vigilius*, & the holy Apostolike See, to record two constitutions, both proceeding *ex Tripode*, fighting *ex Diametro*, and by an unreconciliable contradiction opposed the one to the other. Seeing then both the Emperour, and the Councell meant by their so often expressing the consent of *Vigilius* to them, and by their reciting his Apostolicall Constitution for condemning the Three Chapters in the seventh Collation, seeing they meant hereby to draw others to the like consent to the truth, by the authority and credit of the Pope and his Apostolicall decree: it is not to bee imagined that the Emperour or Councell would at all, either publish in their Synod, or insert among their Acts the contrary Constitution of *Vigilius* in defence of the Three Chapters, in doing whereof they should not onely have for ever disgraced *Vigilius*, but have much impaired the reputation of their owne wisdom, and quite crossed their principall designe: Nay, what will you say if *Baronius* himselfe professe the same? See, and wonder to see him insatuated in this point also. The Bishops, saith he<sup>1</sup>, of this fift Councell, that they might pretend to have the consent of *Vigilius* to those things which they defined, expressed in their sentence, that *Vigilius* had before both in writing and by word condemned these three Chapters, *tacentes omnino quid ab ipso per editum constitutum pendente Synodo pro defensione trium Capitulum decretum esset*; wholly concealing, or saying nothing at all of that decree, which in the time of the Synod hee made for defence of those three Chapters: *Sicque nullam penitus de Vigiliij Constitutione mentionem habendam esse duxerunt*, so they thought fit to make no mention at all of the Constitution of *Vigilius*, wherein he defended the three Chapters. So *Baronius*: whom, speaking the truth, I gladly embrace, and oppose him to himselfe speaking an untruth in malice to these Synodall Acts.

1 Bar. an. 553.  
nu. 218.

5. Now if none of these reasons, nor yet *Baronius* his owne expresse testimony can perswade, but still the Cardinal! or his friends will re-

ply with his *cognoscitur*. It is certainly knowne, that this Papall Constitution did belong to this Synod, yea, to the fift Collation thereof; I would gladly intreat some of them to tell us in this, as in the former concerning *Origen*, who was the thiefe, or robber, that cut out, or pickt away his holinesse Constitution; a more capitall crime than the expiling of the Delphian Temple, or the house of *Jupiter Ammon*. Touch the Popes owne writings, even his *Apostolicall* decree delivered out of the holy Chaire? what *Clement*? what *Ravallack* might be so impious, so audacious, so sacrilegious? was it some *Origenist*? no certainly, the Constitution defending, *that none after their death might be condemned*, was a shield and safe charter for *Origen* to bring him to heaven. Was it some *Monothelite*? nothing lesse; they knew that this Constitution was the overthrow of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and all the former holy Councels, *Hoc Isidorus velit*, they would have wisht the Constitution to have stood for ever: whom may we deeme then to have stolne away that Papall decree? Truly by the old Cassian rule, *Cuius*, none else but either some of the Popes themselves, or some of their favourites, who being ashamed to see such an *hereticall* Constitution of Pope *Vigilius* stand among the Acts, judged theft and sacrilege a lesser crime, than to have the Popes Chaire thought *fallible*, and *hereticall*. Now because I can imagine none to have beene so presumptuous, and such is my charity and favourable opinion of those holy fathers, and their children also, that they would never commit such an hainous crime, as with sacrilege to maime the Acts of the holy Councels, I doe therefore here absolve and acquit them all of this crime, promising against any adversary, be it *Baronius* himselfe, to defend their innocency in this matter, untill some of *Baronius* his friends can either bring some further evidence against them, or else prove, which I thinke they will hardly be able, that a decree, which was never extant among the Synodall Acts, can be stolne or cut away out of the Synodall Acts.



## CAP. XXXI.

The sixth defect in the Synodall Acts preiuded by Baronius, for that the decree which advanced Ierusalem to patriarchall dignity is wanting therein, *refuted*.



THE sixth and last defect is of all the rest most memorable, concerning the advancing of Ierusalem to a Patriarchall See, and annexing some Churches unto it. That this was done in the fifth Councell Baronius<sup>a</sup> proves by Guil. Tyrim<sup>b</sup>, who writeth, that in the fifth Synod in the time of Iustinian, Vigilius, Eutychius, and the rest decreed, that this Bishopricke of Ierusalem should have the place of a Patriarke, with the rest: And because it was situate

in a manner in the limits of the Bishop of Alexandria and Antioch, and so there<sup>c</sup> was no meanes for it to have subordinate Bishops, unlesse somewhat were taken from either of those Patriarkships, therefore it seemed good to the Synod to take part from either; so they tooke from the Bishop of Antioch two Provinces, *Cæsarea* and *Scythopolis*; and two other from the Bishop of Alexandria, *Ruba* and *Beritus*; belides which Metropolitane Sees, they tooke also from the same Patriarks divers Bishopricks, and erected some other; all which (being in number twenty five) they subjected to their new founded Patriarke of Ierusalem. This is the summe of that which Guil. Tyrim, and out of him Baronius delivereth, and Binus<sup>d</sup> addeth this as a fragment or scrap of the fifth Councell, which is now not found among the Acts therof. Baronius<sup>e</sup> further glossing on this text, tels us, that though Iulianus had attempted and obtained this before in the Councell of Chalcedon, when the Pope Legates were absent, yet Pope Leo resisting it, he prevailed not, nor was the matter put in execution; but at this time the ancient order instituted by the Nicene Councell, being inverted, *Cæsarea* was now first of all made subject to the Church of Ierusalem, which now was become a Patriarchall See.

2. This whole passage of Baronius (approving that testimony of Guil. Tyrim which is justly refuted by Berterius<sup>h</sup>) I cannot tell what to call, but sure I am, it consists of divers untruths, not so much upon ignorance (then his Sinne had beene lesse) as maliciously objected against the Acts of this holy Synod; some of them I will explaine, beginning with that which is the maine point of all. First then it is untrue, that this fifth Synod advanced the See of Ierusalem to a Patriarkship. Not to the name and title of a Patriarke, for that it had long before, as Bellar.<sup>i</sup> and Binus<sup>k</sup> professe; & though it was but a single Bishoprick, subject, as both Ierome,<sup>l</sup> and the Nicene<sup>m</sup> Councell declare, to the Bi-

a An. 553. nu. 245. Alla illa desidia variogaudia, quibus obstat de aduersis Patriarchatus Hierosolymitano Ecclesiis, &c. b De Ballo sacro, lib. 24. ca. 12. c Non habens unde illi ubi ordinares suffraganeis, nisi in trique Patriarche aliquid detraheret. d Bin inter fragmenta addit post c. 5. pa. 606. a. e An. 553. nu. 246. f Post absentiam Legatorum. Ibid. g Sic igitur in cunctis antiquis ordinibus à Nicæno Constituto instituto, Cæsariensis Ecclesia, totius Palæstina Metropolis nunc primum subleuata est Hierosolymorum Ecclesia. Bar. Ibid. h Diatr. 2. ca. 2. i Hierosolimitana per annos fere quingentos habita est quarta Patriarchalis sed nomine non re, seu honore non potestate. Bell. lib. 1. de Pontif. Rom. ca. 24. k Binus verba Bellar. repetit, et ait id patere ex Conc. Nic. Can. 7. notum Epist. 3. notum Epist. 3. notum Epist. 3.

Annot. to. 1. Conc. pa. 105. et not. in Conc. Nicen. ca. 7. pa. 310. a. I Hoc ibi (in Conc. Nic.) accernitur ut Palæstina Metropolis Cæsariensis sit, et totius Orientis Antiochia, Mior. Epist. ad Pammach. contra Iulian. Epist. Hierosol. an habeat illa iudicij sui consequentiam (post Antiochiam) Metropolis propria dignitate formata. Conc. Nic. Can. 7.

in Hierosolymita-  
nis episcopus  
sedebat. 4. loco,  
sed nulli Archi-  
episcopo vel  
Episcopo prece-  
rat. Bell. loc. cit.  
o Nam sedet 4.  
loco in Concilio  
Niceno, et sub-  
scribit ante Epif-  
copum Casariem-  
sem in Conc. Ni-  
ceno, et Constant.  
ut ex subscriptione  
liquet, et in  
Conc. Chalced.  
Act. 5.  
p. Epist. 62.  
Leonis.  
q. Placuit mihi  
(ait Maximus)  
et Iuvenalis prop-  
ter multam con-  
tentionem ut se-  
des Antiochena  
habeat duas  
Phenicias et  
Arabiam, se-  
des autem Hier-  
osolymorum ha-  
beat tres: Palesti-  
nas, et rogamus  
ex decreto vestro  
hec firmari.  
Conc. Chalced. Act.  
7. p. 105.  
1. ibid.  
1. Aug. l. 2. ca. 18  
2. Nic. Callist.  
lib. 15. ca. 30.

6. An. 451. num.  
124.  
x. Not. in Conc.  
Chalced. p. 184. b.

y. An. 553. num.  
240.

shop of *Antioch*, as his Patriarke, and to the Bishop of *Cesarea Palestina*, (for there is another in *Cappadocia*;) as his Metropolitane, yet for honor of our Saviors resurrection in that place, it had the name of a Patriark, and preeminency in Councils to the Bishop of *Casarea*. Not to the authoritie and power of a Patriarke, for that it had, and had it justly, long before this fift Councell, even by the decree and judgement of the Councell of *Chalcedon*. *Iuvenalis* had sued for it in the *Ephesine Councell*, but the Bish. of *Antioch*, as it seemeth, then being unwilling to manumit him, & as it were, free him from his subjection, *Eyrill* resisted it & writ to Pope *Leo*, praying him to do the like. But after long contention both parties being thoroughly agreed, the matter was brought to the Councell of *Chalcedon*, where *Maximus* and *Iuvenalis*, the Bishops of both Sees, first of all, and before the whole Councell, professed that they were both willing, that the Bishop of *Antioch* should hold the two *Phenicias* and *Arabia*, and the Bishop of *Ierusalem* should hold the three *Palestinaes*, and they both requested the whole Synod to decree, confirme, and ratifie the same. The whole Councell thereupon by their decree confirmed the same, all the most reverend Bishops cryed, *We all say the same, and we consent therunto*. After them the most glorious Judges in the name of the Emperor, added Imperiall authority and the royall assent to the Synods decree, saying, *Firmum etiam per nostrum decretum & sententiam Concilij in omni tempore permanebit hoc*; this shall abide firme for ever by our decree, and by the judgement of the Councell, that the Church of *Antioch* have under it the two *Phenicias*, and *Arabia*; & the Church of *Ierusalem* have under it the three *Palestines*. Thus the Judges. The same Decree of this Councell at *Chalcedon* is expressly testified both by *Evagrius* and *Nicephorus*. So untrue it is which *Gual. Tyrinus*, and out of him *Baronius* avoucheth, that the Church of *Ierusalem* was first made a Patriarchall See, or had the Provinces and Metropolitans of *Casarea* and *Scitopolis* annexed unto it by the fift Councell, that it is undoubtedly certaine, that it had with the title and dignity, true Patriarchal authority and power over divers Provinces; together with their inferiour Bishops conferred upon it, with a plenary consent of the whole Church in the Councell of *Chalcedon*. And that you may see the most shamefull dealing both of *Bar.* and *Binius* in another place (where their choller against this fift Councell was not moved) they acknowledge that truth; for intreating of the Councell at *Chalcedon*: *In this seventh Session of it, saith Baronius*, (and the like doth *Binius* \*) *was the controversie composed betwixt the Bishops of Antioch & Ierusalem, and the cause being judged, the two Phenicia and Arabia, were given to the Bishop of Antioch, and the three Palestines were adjudged to the Bishop of Hierusalem, ex quibus jam perspicue apparet jus Metropolis in Hierosolymitanam Ecclesiam esse translatum; whence it doth evidently appeare, that the right of the Metropolis which before belonged to the Bishop of Casarea was translated to the Bishop of Ierusalem*. So they: who yet in hatred against the Acts of the fift Councell with faces of Adamant deny that truth which here they confesse to be cleare and conspicuous.

3. But (saith the Cardinall \*) the decree of *Chalcedon* was made, post absentiam Legatorum, when the Popes Legates were now gone, and

of

so they being absent, is to be held invalid. O the forehead of the Cardinall! Were the Popes Legats absent? were they gone? Truly they were not onely present at this decree, and consenting unto it, but after it was proposed by *Maximus* and *Iuuenalis*, they were the very first men that gave sentence therein, whose sentence the whole Councell followed. For thus it is sayd<sup>2</sup>, *Pascasinus* and *Lucentius* the most reverend Bishops, and *Boniface* a Presbyter, these holding the place of the Apostolike See, said by *Pascasinus*; These things betwixt *Maximus* and *Iuuenalis* are knowne to be done for their good and peace; & nostra humilitatis interloquutione firmantur, and they are confirmed by the interloquution of our humility; ut nulla posterum de hac causa sit contentio, that never hereafter there should be any contention about this matter betweene these Churches. Is it credible that the Cardinall could be so audacious and impudent, as to utter such palpable untruths? Vnlesse he had quite put off, I say not modesty, but reason, sense, and almost humane nature. Let this stand for the second capitall untruth in this passage.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. Chalc.  
Act. 7. pa. 105. d

4. Yet Pope *Leo* himselfe, saith *Baronius*<sup>a</sup>, withstood that Decree of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, because it was prejudiciall to the rights of other Churches; and by reason he consented not, it was not put in execution, as it was after this Decree of the fift Synod. Had the Cardinall and his friends beene well advised, they would feare, and bee much ashamed once to mention the resistance of Pope *Leo* to the Councell at *Chalcedon*, either in those Patriarks, or in the other of *Constantinople*: for first the resistance of *Leo*, which was meereely ineffective, demonstrates, that the Popes contradiction; with all his might and power, can neither disanull nor infringe the judgement of a generall Councell; which is no small prejudice to his Princehood; or Princely supremacy. Againe, it convinceth *Leo* of a very foule and unexcusable error, seeing *Leo* judged the Nicene Canons concerning matters of order, policie, and government of the Church (such as these are about the extent of Sees, or superiority of one Patriarke or Bishop above another) to be unalterable and eternall, no lesse than the decrees of faith: The condition (saith hee<sup>b</sup>) of the Nicene Canons (in the margin hee points at the sixt and seventh, both wh<sup>ch</sup> concerne the limits of Sees) being ordained by the Spirit of God, is in no part soluble; and whatsoever is diverse from their Constitution, omni penitus authoritate vacuum est; is utterly void of all authority, by whomsoever it bee decreed; fewer or more. Againe<sup>c</sup>, the Nicene fathers, after they had condemned *Arian*, made lawes of Ecclesiasticall Canons, mansuras usque in finem mundi, which are to stand in force untill the end of the world; and if ought be any where presumed to bee done otherwise than they have decreed, sine cunctatione cassatur, it is presently made void. Againe<sup>d</sup>, the priviledges of Churches being instituted by the Canons of the holy Fathers, and confirmed by the Nicene decrees, nulla possunt improbitate sacrali; nulla novitate mutari; they can bee infringed by no improbitie, they can by no novelty bee altered. Againe<sup>e</sup>, concerning *Iuuenalis* Bishop of *Ierusalem*, who was now truly made a Patriarke, for keeping the Statutes of the holy fathers, which in the Nicene Synod are confirmed, invariabilibus decretis, by inviolable decrees; I admonish your sanctity;

a Loco citato.

b Leo Epist. 53.

c Epist. e. dem.

d Epist. 54.

e Epist. 61.



Epist. 62.

g Hec sancta &  
magna Synodus,  
tam in seniori  
& nova Roma,  
quam in sede A-  
lexandriae, An-  
tiochia et Hiero-  
solythorum  
priscam consue-  
tudinē decernit  
in omnibus con-  
servari, ita ut  
eorum praesules  
universorum  
Metropolitano-  
rum qui ab ipsis  
promoveantur,  
habeant potesta-  
tem, ad convocan-  
dum eos, ad con-  
cedendum et corri-  
gendum. Can. 17  
Conc. 8. apud  
Bin. pa. 850.  
h Conc. Later. 4.  
habitu sub In-  
noc. 3. ca. 5.  
i Quo minus ea  
(qua Chalcedo-  
ne obtinuit Ieru-  
salem) executi-  
oni mandata ef-  
fent. Leo Rom.  
Pont. intercessit.  
Nunc ergo pri-  
mum (in Concilio  
5.) Hieroso-  
lythorum Eccle-  
sia Patriarcha-  
tu verē aucta  
cognoscitur.  
Bar. an.  
553. an. 246.  
k Al. 7.  
l Nov. 131. ca.  
1. et 2.  
m Data est No-  
vel. Basilio Const.  
ut in fine ejus  
liquet, si vero est  
annus Regni Ju-  
stiniani 15. et  
Conc. 4. habitum  
an. 1052. 27.

sanctity, that the lawes of the Churches remaine; let no mans ambiti-  
on cover that which is another mans, let no man seeke by impairing  
another to advance himselfe, for though they thinke to strengthen  
their desires by Councils, *infirmum atque irritum erit quicquid à prae-  
dicatorum patrum Canonibus discreparit*; whatsoever is diverse from these  
Nicene Canons shall bee void. Lastly <sup>f</sup>, to *Maximus* Bishop of *An-  
tioch*, let it suffice that I pronounce this in generall, *ad omnia*, for all  
matters, concerning limits of Sees, and the like, that if any thing bee  
attempted by any man, in any Synod, against the Statutes of the Ni-  
cene Canons, *nihil praedicti potest inviolabilibus inferre decretis*, it can  
bring no prejudice to these unalterable and inviolable decrees. Thus  
Pope *Leo* erroneously judging the order set downe in the Nicene Ca-  
nons, for the bounds and prebeminence of Bishops to be for ever, or  
by any Councell whatsoever immutable.

5. See now the wisdom of the Cardinall in alleaging Pope *Leo*.  
If the decree at *Chalcedon* was not of force because *Leo* contradicted  
it, then neither can that other decree, supposed to bee made in the  
fift Councell, be of force, because *Leo* contradicted it also, for by *Leo*  
his judgement, at no time, by no person, by no Councell, by no autho-  
rity can the order set downe at Nice bee changed. If that at *Chalcedon*  
was not in force, to which the Popes Legates consented, how can the  
Cardinall thinke this of the fift Councell to bee of force, to  
which neither Pope nor Legate consented, nor was so much as pre-  
sent in the Councell. If the judgment of *Leo* stand for good, then nei-  
ther is, nor ever was either *Constantinople* or *Ierusalem* Patriarchall  
Sees; & then the decree of the eighth Councell <sup>s</sup>, and the <sup>k</sup> Laterane,  
and I know not how many Councils must bee rejected as unlawfull  
and impious, if the judgement of *Leo* be (as by the eighth Councell  
and their Laterane it is adjudged) erroneous, then was *Ierusalem* a  
Patriarchall See, notwithstanding the contradiction of *Leo* to that  
decree. In a word, if *Leo* his judgement be of force, it repeales the  
decree of the fift, eighth, and all other generall Councils decreeing  
this; if it be not of force, it neither did nor could infringe the decree  
of *Chalcedon*. So unadvised was the Cardinall in alleaging the re-  
sistance of *Leo* to that decree.

6. And to satisfie the Cardinall yet a little more fully, it is an im-  
truth which hee saith <sup>i</sup>, that the Decree of *Chalcedon* was not put in ex-  
ecution before the time of this fift Synod, and this supposed decree  
therof, for the Councell of *Chalcedon* <sup>k</sup> decreed that their sentence in  
advancing *Ierusalem* to a Patriarchall See, should stand in force *in omni  
tempore*, and therefore doubtlesse even then, and from that very time it  
was truly a Patriarchall See, the contradiction of *Leo* no more hin-  
dring it the very next or second yeare, than it did two hundred or  
two thousand yeares after that decree made. Again, as it is certaine  
for the See of *Constantinople*, that it both before and after the Decree  
of *Chalcedon* (which was not inductory but confirmative in that  
point) exercised Patriarchall authority, *Iustinian* also by his Imperi-  
all law <sup>l</sup> made some twelve <sup>m</sup> yeares before the fift Councell, confirming  
the same; and so it is not to bee doubted but the Church of *Ierusalem*  
did

did the very like in it owne Patriarchall Dioceſſe, eſpecially conſidering, that the Imperiall law of *Iuſtinian* is as forcible<sup>n</sup> for the one as for the other: So that for any one to have denyed or ſought then to have infringed the Patriarchall authority confirmed to *Conſtantinople*, conferred to *Ieruſalem* by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, had brought him into danger not onely of Eccleſiaſticall cenſure, but of civill puniſhments, and of the Emperours high indignation: Or if the Cardinall will not bee ſatisfied unleſſe hee ſee the practice of that Patriarchall authority, let him looke in the general Councell under *Mennas*, and there hee ſhall ſee *Iohn* Biſhop of *Ieruſalem* hold a Provinciall Councell of the Biſhops of the three *Paleſtines*, qui ſub eo ſunt, who were under him, two of which, as by their ſubſcriptions appeare, were the Metropolitan Biſhops of *Cafarea* and *Scythopolis*, with thirty moe; ſo many were then ſubject to the Patriarke of *Ieruſalem*. Again, in another Provinciall Councell held at *Ieruſalem* the tenth yeare of *Iuſtinian*, *Peter*, Patriarch of *Ieruſalem*, is Preſident<sup>i</sup> over all the Biſhops of the three *Paleſtines* there aſſembled with him, two of which were the foreſaid Metropolitans. So untrue it is which *Baronius* to maintaine the falſe testimony of *Guil. Tyrius* avoucheth, that the *Decree* of *Chalcedon* was not put in execution before this fiſt Councell. Let this bee ſcored for his third capitall untruth in this ſhort paſſage.

7. A fourth untruth is that which is ſaid in the fragments, that the Councell had no other meanes to erect this Patriarchſhip of *Ieruſalem*, but by taking part from both the other of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, for there was another meanes, as both the *Decree* of *Chalcedon*, and the event did ſhew, and nothing at all was taken from the See of *Alexandria*.

8. A fiſt untruth is, that they tooke from *Alexandria* the Metropolitan Sees and Provinces of *Ruba* and *Berithus*, for neither of theſe Sees belonged to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, but of *Antioch*; of them both *Berterius*<sup>r</sup> (refuting this very fragment, which the Cardinall and *Binius* ſo gladly ſnatch at) ſaith<sup>s</sup>, certainly *Ruba* is placed by *Protolome* in *Syria*; and it is manifeſt, that *Berithus* is the Metropolis of *Phenicia*, neare *Libanus*: *Syria autem & Phenicia Orientis Provincia omnibus nota ſunt; but Syria and Phœnicia to be Provinces of the Eaſt* (and ſo belonging formerly to the See of *Antioch*) all men doe know. Thus hee; and for *Berithus* the matter is certaine, that it is not neare the bounds or limits of *Alexandria*, for that it is in the Province of *Phenicia*, not onely *Protolome*<sup>e</sup> ſhewes, but the ſubſcriptions of the Biſhops, both in the *Nicene*<sup>d</sup>, in the fiſt *Conſtantinopolitane*<sup>e</sup>, and *Chalcedon*<sup>f</sup> Councels, in all which the Biſhop of *Berithus* is ſet in the Province of *Phenicia*; whence againe a ſixt untruth is to bee obſerved in that fragment of *Tyrius*, for it ſaith<sup>g</sup>, that *Berithus* was granted to the new Patriarch of *Ieruſalem*; whereas it is cleare, that it was in *Phenicia*, & that the two *Phenicia*<sup>h</sup>, both by the agreement of *Max.* and *Iuvenalis*, and by the de-

n Saucimus vi-  
cem legum obtri-  
nere ſimiles Ec-  
cleſiaſticas regu-  
las que à ſanctis  
a. Concilijs expo-  
ſite ſunt, ſunt fir-  
mate, Nov. ca-  
dem ca. 1.

o Act. 3. pa.  
455. et ſeq.  
p Conc. Hierof.  
contra Severum  
et alios extat, 10. 5  
Conc. pa. 472.  
q Preſidente  
ſanctiſſimo  
Patriarcha Pe-  
tro, aſſiſtentibus  
Epiſcopis triumi  
Paleſtinarum.  
Ibid.

r Diar. 2. ca. 2.  
ſ At certe *Ruba*  
à *Protolome* in  
*Syria* ponitur, et  
*Berithum* *Phœ-  
nicis Libani*  
Metropolim eſſe  
conſtat, *Syria au-  
tem et Phœnicie*  
*Orientis Provin-  
cie omnibus no-  
ta ſunt: Nihil*  
*igitur ab Ægyp-  
tiaca Alexandria*  
*ni Patriarche*  
*diocæſi accepit*  
*Hieropolymita-  
nus. Quod ſi ita*  
*eſt, non temere*  
*Tyrius et veteri*  
*huic ſcripto*  
*(fragmento ſci-  
licet Euvomiana-  
e & Biniæ)*  
*fides adhibenda*  
*Berth. Ibid.*

c Paol. Geog. lib.  
5. ca. 25. ubi *Ber-  
ithum* ponit ſi-  
tum in *Syria*.  
d Province  
*Phœnicie Græco-  
rius Berithi, pa:*  
*310. b.*  
e Province  
*Phœnicis Trium-  
phens Berithus,*  
*pa. 513. a.*  
f Enſt. *Berithi*  
*civitatis Phœni-  
cis maritima.*  
g Aſt. 1. pa. 2. a.

<sup>r</sup> Subtraxerunt Alexandrino Eccleſiam Berithenſem; et quoniam iterum eundem Patriarcham (Hieropolymitanum) oportebat habere oratione ſupradictos Metropolitanoſ, &c. Frag. ſup. citato.  
<sup>h</sup> Concil. Chalced. Aſt. 7. pa. 105. ut ſedes Antiochena b.

tree of the Councell of Chalcedon did belong to the See and Bishop of Antioch, and not of Ierusalem.

1 Lib. 7. Ind. 3.  
Epist. 54.

9. Is not this now thinke you a worthy fragment which *Baronius* and *Binius* have found to be wanting, and will you, nill you, will needs fasten to the fift Councell? Are not they excellent Surgeons to cure lame Councels? who to the faire and authenticke Acts and Records of this Synod would patch such a rablement of untruths, quite repugnant to the minde of this fift Synod? For seeing as *Gregory*<sup>i</sup> truly saith, it was *in omnibus sequax*, in all things a follower of the Councell at Chalcedon, most certainly it never either decreed or approved this of taking ought from the See of Alexandria, or of adding *Berithus* and *Ruba* to the See of Ierusalem; both which are directly contrary to the Decree of Chalcedon, which this fift Councell followeth. Let the Cardinall and *Binius* themselves feed upon these and such like scraps and huskes, they are fit and dainty meat for the Cardinals tooth and palate, which relissheth little, unlesse it have a touch of falshood. But as I sayd before, so I here againe proclame, let all Councels be a thousand times lame, rather than receive any crutches of the Cardinals and of *Binius* devising and framing. And now you have all their defectives, wherein I doubt not but every one seeth both the defects to rest in their corrupted judgement, and the truth of these Acts to bee much more confirmed hereby; seeing neither the craft, nor malice, nor extreme labour of *Baronius* and *Binius* was able to finde so much as any one thing which is wanting or defective in them.

## CAP. XXXII.

The two first additions to the Synodall Acts pretended by *Baronius*, for that the Epistle of *Mennas* to *Vigilius*, and the two lawes of *Theodosius* are falsly inserted therein, refused.

a iam ad postre-  
mum videamus  
que ab impossi-  
bilibus fuerunt 5.  
Synodi nomine  
pervulgata. Bar.  
an. 553. nu. 247.  
b An. cod. nu.  
238.  
c An. cod. nu. 19.



Et us in the last place, saith *Baronius*<sup>a</sup>, see what things Impostours have published under the name of the fift Synod; *Quæve*<sup>b</sup> spuria ei-  
dem acceperunt, and what counterfeit additions are inserted in these Acts. Of these in generall the Cardinall<sup>c</sup> tels us, *Pudenda planè in istis inmixta habentur*, there are inserted very shamefull matters into these Acts, such as are altogether unworthy of an oecumenical Synod. An haynotus crime indeed, if the Cardinall can iustifie this. For though we might deplore the defects if ought were wanting, yet that is no prejudice to the truth of that which remaineth, no more than the extreme want and shipwracke of the Nicene Acts, doth or can discredit the truth of the Canons which are come safe to land. But if in these Acts which now are extant, and passe for the true and faithfull Acts of the fift Synod, Impostors have inserted false and counterfeit writings, that may cause one justly to misdoubt the truth of these acts which wee have: for why (will some say) may not that part, or any one



one bee forged or foisted in, as well as this or that? Let us then see how well the Cardinal doth prove this redundant corruption in these Acts which now are extant of this fift Councell: his proofes thereof are five.

2. The first<sup>d</sup> is taken out of the sixt generall Councell, in which when the Monothelites alledged an Epistle of *Mennas* to *Vigilius* as out of the Acts of the fift Synod, *It was proved that those Acts were corrupted, and that the heretikes had inserted three quaternions, that is, four and twenty leaves into the same Acts.* Again<sup>e</sup>, in the 7. Action or Collocation it was found further, *that they added two Epistles of Vigilius one to Iustinian, and the other to Theodora; by which you see, saith the Cardinal<sup>f</sup>, that the Acts of the fift Synod have beene foully corrupted by the Monothelites.* We see it indeed. And wee see withall another thing no lesse remarkable and cleare; that the Cardinall is an infamous slanderer; and playes the trifling Sophister in the highest degree. Who ever doubted or denied, but that some copies of the Acts of this Synod have beene corrupted? of this, none that read the sixt<sup>g</sup> Councell can make the least question in the world. For three corrupted copies were produced<sup>h</sup> and examined, and some other were mentioned, and the authors, both who falsified them; and who writ the inserted additions are all there recorded. Nay the three corrupted copies were not onely discovered, but *accursed<sup>i</sup>, defaced<sup>k</sup>, and raced* before the whole Synod, so farre as any corruption could bee found. Doth the Cardinall know any man to defend as sincere; or justifie one of those corrupted Monothelite copies? If he doe, the sixt Councell is an unresistible record against such; and we will joyne with him in confusing such audaciousnesse. Or will the Cardinall say; that the Acts of the fift Synod which are now extant, either have those additions; or were written and taken out of those corrupted and falsified copies? It is as cleare as the Sun they are not, for not one of those Monothelite additions are in these Acts now extant. These Acts, and no other are they which we defend, and which the Cardinall undertooke to disgrace, and prove to bee corrupted; and to have forgeries patched unto them. Against these Acts; the Cardinalls prooffe out of the sixt Synod is so idle, and so ridiculously sophisticall; as not disputing *ad idem*, that hee had need to pray that the Sophisters in our Schoolés heare not of, and applaud his rare skill in Logicke. If because some copies were corrupted by the Monothelites, those which most certainly escaped their hands must bee condemned; then no deed, nor testament, though never so truly authentickall, may be trusted; for a forger may exscribe it, and adde what he pleaseth in his extracted copy; or because the Romanie copies of the Nicene Canons were corrupted by *Zozimus*, *Bonifatius*, or some of their friends, therefore the authenticke records thereof (the true copies of which the Africane Bishops with much labour purchased from *Constantinople* and *Alexandria*), must be distrusted: which yet the Africane Synod (*Saint Augustin* among the rest) so much honoured, that they gave a just check to the Pope, and manifested that blot in him, which all the water in *Tiber* will never wash away.

d Monothelitismum fuit inventum ut sub tit. lq. 5. Synodi, epistolam Mennae ediderint. Bar. an. 553. no. 247. e Dicit in ea (7. Actione concil. 5.) Epistole invenitae sunt quas commentitas esse & suppositas manifeste probaverunt. ibid. f Vides igitur quam fuerit 5. Synodus tum ab Origenista, tum a Monothelitis detecta temporibus lancinata. ibid. g Act. 3. & Act. 14. h Act. 14. i Anathema libro qui dicitur Menna ad Vigilium, & qui cum finxerunt fidei scripturunt. Anathema libris qui dicuntur falsi fuisse a Vigilio ad Iustinianum et Theodorum. Anathema simul eis qui falsaverunt acta sancti & universalis quinti Concilii. ibid. pa. 74. b. k Chortaceum volumen quod falsatum est discernimus cassari in locis, in quibus adiectiones sunt factae. totosque libros etiam eos, obliis obduci, in locis in quibus depravati sunt, & cassari, &c. ibid. pa. 73.

in An. 554. nu. 8  
 Exemplaria ge-  
 nuna misisse  
 noscitur Grego-  
 rius.  
 in Germana ex-  
 emplaria S. Sy-  
 nodi vidit &  
 cognovit S. Gre-  
 gorius lib. 12.  
 Epist. 7. Bin. pa.  
 607. a.  
 o S. Greg. lib. 7.  
 Epist. 54. in de-  
 pravata Synodi  
 (quinta) exem-  
 plaria incidisse  
 liquet, dum ait  
 idem negasse  
 distam epistolam  
 esse suam. Bar.  
 an. 448. nu. 76.  
 p Obijt Greg. an.  
 604. Con. 6. ba-  
 bitum. an. 681.  
 q Prefator duos  
 libros falsatos  
 esse, eo quod neq;  
 in unum & prola-  
 tu antiquis &  
 immutatis li-  
 b. is, ejusdem  
 sancti concilij,  
 neque in charac-  
 tero libro qui in  
 recentis inventus  
 est apud biblio-  
 thecam venera-  
 bilis Pat. archiep.  
 A. 14. pa. 73. b

3. The Cardinall<sup>m</sup>, and after him *Binus*<sup>m</sup>, tels us a great matter and rare newes, that in Pope *Gregories* time, the Acts of this Synod were intire, and that he sent the genuine copy thereof to Queen *Theodolinda*: (An evidence by the way that the Cardinall<sup>o</sup> wittingly and wilfully slandereth the acts which *Gregory* followed to have beene corrupted; wherein *Ibas* is truly said (as the true genuine acts doe also witnessse) to have denyed the *Epistle* to be his.) But let that passe: why doe they mention the Copies of the Acts to have been sincere in *Gregories* time; as if after that time no true copies thereof could be found? In the sixt Councell more than 70. <sup>p</sup> yeares after the death of *Gregory*, divers true; ancient; and incorrupt copies<sup>9</sup> were produced of the same: one of them were found in the very Registry at *Constantinople*, which the Monothelites of that See had not corrupted and falsified; by it and the other true and entire copies, were discovered and convinced the corruption of those three bookes which they cancelled and defaced; how will or can either the Cardinall or *Binus*, or any other, prove that these Acts now extant, are not consonant to those, or taken out, or published according to them? Truly I doe verily perswade my selfe, considering both that the sixt Councell was so carefull and vigilant to preserve the true Acts; and also that these which now we have, are so exact, as before I have declared, that these are no other than the copies of those selfe same ancient and incorrupted acts (save some few and light faults, which by the writers thereof have happened) which Pope *Gregory* had, and in that sixt Councell were read, and commended to all posterity. And I doubt not but the fraud of heretikes being then so fully and openly discovered, the Church ever since hath most diligently and curiously, not onely carefully, preserved the same. Which may well be thought to bee the true cause, why of all the eight Councils the Acts of these three last, that at *Chalcedon*, this fift, and the other of the sixt, are come most safe and intire unto our hands: Howsoever, certaine it is that the Cardinall and *Binus* doe most childishly sophisticate, in accusing the copies of the Acts now extant, (which onely we defend) to be corrupted, because those three or moe copies of the Acts which were produced in the sixt Synod, (which we detest and condemne much more than the Cardinall) were falsified by the Monothelites, none of those false additions being found in these.

in An. 553. nu. 46.

† Tit. de heret.  
 lib. 66. Damasc.

4. The second imposture or fictitious writing which *Baronius* observeth to be inserted in these acts, are the two lawes of *Theodosius* against *Nestorius*, recited in the fift Collation. We may not omit this, sayth he<sup>r</sup>, that those lawes of *Theodosius* against *Nestorius*, aliter se habere in Codice Theodosiano, are otherwise set downe both in the Code of *Theodosius*, and in the Ephesine Councell, in which there is no mention at all of *Theodore*, as in one of these there is: and then hee concludeth, hac de commentitiis scriptis, this may be spoken of the counterfeits writings inserted in these Acts. Thus *Baronius*. I am somewhat ashamed that such a reason should slip from a Cardinall, specially from *Baronius*, for it bewrayes an exceeding imbecility of judgement. There is but one law extant in the *Theodosian Code* against *Nestorius*, and the followers of his

his sect. Now because the lawes which are recited in the Synodall Acts of this fift Councell, are different from it, hereupon the Cardinall presently concludes it to be a forgery, an imposture: he might as well conclude the Gospell of S. Luke, or S. Iohn to bee forged, because they differ from the Gospels of *Matthew* and *Marke*: or the Booke of *Deuteronomy* to be forged, because some lawes in *Exodus* are different from some in *Deuteronomy*. Is it possible, or credible, that *Baronius* could be so simple, and so infatuated, as to thinke one Emperour might not make divers lawes concerning one heresie? specially against divers persons, or divers writings, though all of them supporting one heresie? The law in the *Code* and these in the Acts are different lawes: True, they are so: but can the Cardinall prove, or doth he once offer to prove that they are one law? and that they ought not to differ? No: the Cardinall was wise enough not to undertake so hard a taske. For it is as evident as the Sun, that the law against *Nestorius* which is in the *Code* was one, and first published; and long after that these which are recited in the Acts. In the one of these it is said, *Iterum, igitur doctrina Diodori, & Theodori, & Nestorij visa est nobis abominanda, It seemes good to us againe to detest the doctrine of Diodorus, Theodorus, and Nestorius.* This *Iterum*, imports it was once done before in a former law; and now in this the Emperour would doe the same again. As the lawes, so the occasion of them, was quite different. That in the *Code* was made indeed against the heresies of the Nestorians, but in it none of them were personally & by name condemned; but only *Nestorius*, all the rest who favoured that heresie, were in a generality, not by name condemned; because when that law was made, the Nestorians honoured, and held *Nestorius* for their chiefest patron; and urged his writings: In these two recited in the Acts, *Diodorus* of *Tarsis*, *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, and their writings, are particularly, and by name condemned; as well as *Nestorius*: and in the later the writings also of *Theodoret* against *Cyrril*: for when after that first law set downe in the *Code*, the Nestorians durst not, nor could without danger of punishment either praise *Nestorius*, or reade, write, or urge his books; which were all by that law condemned: then they began to magnifie *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, and *Diodorus*, and the writing of *Theodoret*, all which were as plaine and plentifull for their heresie, as *Nestorius* himselfe: but because these were not as yet by name condemned, nor by name prohibited, they presumed more boldly to rely on them. The Catholikes, and specially they of Armenia, as is witnessed in a letter from them to *Proclus*, seeing this their new device, entreated the Emperour *Theodosius* to stop that wicked course, & to condemne by name *Theodorus*, as well as hee had done *Nestorius*. Which though at the first the Emperour did not, yet seeing how insolent the Nestorians grew upon those writings, long after the former, he published these two, condemning now *explicitè* by name, and in paticular, *Diodorus*, *Theodorus*, and the writing of *Theodoret*, which before were onely *implicitè*, and in a generality condemned. When the lawes, the occasion, the time of promulgation, were all different, was not the Cardinall, thinke you, bereft of judgement, who would prove these later to bee forged

Coll. 5. pa. 544.  
& seq.

u Pa. 544. b.

x Coll. 5. pa. 542



forged and counterfeit, because they differ from the former, with which they should not agree.

5. It may be the Cardinall thought that all lawes were expressed in the Code, and therefore if there had beene any such lawes as they, they would have beene there set downe. A conceit I beleeve which will never enter into any mans mind, while he hath use of his five wits, but into the Cardinals, who hath conceits by himselfe, and knoweth notes above *El4*. To say nothing of the twelve Tables, and of all the ancient Romane lawes, (no part of which are extant in the Theodosian Code,) the most ancient law mentioned in the Gregorian, surpasseth not the time of the Emperour *Antoninus*<sup>c</sup>; and in the Theodosian, not the time of *Constantine*. Can the Cardinall assure us that all the Lawes of *Constantine*, *Constantius*, and the other Emperours till the time of *Theodosius* the younger, are expressed in this Code? *Eusebius*<sup>d</sup>, and *Zozomen*<sup>e</sup> mention divers of *Constantines* lawes, *Pro liberatione exulium*, *Pro reducendis relegatis*, *Pro ijs qui ad metalla damnati erant*, *Pro confessoribus*, *Pro ingenuis*, *Quod Ecclesia sit haeres ijs quibus nemo de sanguine superuerit*; *De sacellis*, & *cemiteriis*, and many the like; none of which are in the Theodosian Code; they were all published, if the Cardinall say true, in the Consulship of *Licinius*, the fift time, and *Crispus*; for which yeare the Code hath no lawes, but two<sup>a</sup>, one *De veteranis*, and another *De parricidio*.

6. To come yet nearer to the very times of *Theodosius*; besides all these, he made another Edict and law against *Nestorius*<sup>b</sup>, commanding if any Bishop or Clerke mention that heresie, that hee should forthwith be deposed; if a Laicke, bee anathematized; in which law hee particularly commandeth *Irenaeus* Bishop of *Tyrus* to be deposed from his See. This law, though it is both recorded in the Acts of the Ephesine Councell, and confessed by the Cardinall<sup>c</sup> to bee truly the Emperours Law; yet is not extant in the Code, nor is it all one with that which is there set downe. The Cardinall by the same reason might prove it a forgery, as well as those other two, and conclude the Acts of the Ephesine Councell to be falsified by Impostors, and so to be of no credit, as well as the Acts of this fift Synod. Further yet, there was another law against *Nestorius* published by the same *Theodosius* after the Ephesine latrociny, and recorded in the Acts of the Councell<sup>d</sup> at *Chalcedon*; wherein the Emperour shewes againe his detestation of that heresie, approving the condemning and deposing of *Domnus*, of *Theodoret* and *Prenie*, Nestorian Bishops, as also of *Flavianus*, and *Eusebius* of *Dorilen*, whom he thought to be Nestorians: but therein the Emperour was mis-informed, as hee had beene before, in the time of the holy Ephesine Synod, when upon like mis-information hee condemned *Cyrill* and *Memnon*, as well as *Nestorius*. That law, though acknowledged also by *Baronius*<sup>e</sup> to be true, is not extant in the Theodosian Code, nor doth it accord with that which is there expressed: would not any man thinke it ridiculous hence to conclude as the Cardinall doth, that certainly it is therefore a forgery, and the Acts of *Chalcedon* containing such forgeries, are to be held of no credit? Thus while the Cardinall labours to discredit these Acts, he so foully disgraceth him

<sup>f</sup> Nam i. lex ibi posita, est imperante Antonino & Severo.  
<sup>g</sup> Vt liquet ex tit. 1. l. 1.  
<sup>h</sup> Lib. 2. de vita Constant. ca. 30.  
<sup>i</sup> 31. & seq.  
<sup>k</sup> Lib. 1. ca. 8.

<sup>y</sup> an. 318. nu. 37.  
<sup>a</sup> Vide Chronol. omnium Consil. Imperat. servata Consulium ratione. extat post finem Codicis Theod.  
<sup>b</sup> Extat illa lex dom. 5. Conc. Ephes. ca. 19.

<sup>c</sup> An. 448. nu. 2. & seq.

<sup>d</sup> An. 451. nu. 83.

<sup>e</sup> an. 449. n. 130

himselfe, that men may justly doubt whether hee were his owne man when he writ these things, which are so voidé both of truth and reason.

CAP. XXXIII.

The third addition to the Synodall Acts pretended by Baronius, for that the Epistle of Theodoret written to Nestorius after the union, is falsely inserted, refused.



He third prooffe which *Baronius*<sup>a</sup> brings to shew that these Acts are corrupted by the additions of some forged writings inserted among them; is an Epistle of Theodoret written to Nestorius after the union set downe in the fift Collation<sup>b</sup>, wherein Theodoret professeth to Nestorius, that he did not receive the letters of Cyrillus as orthodoxall; nay, hee. sheweth himselfe so averse from consenting to them; and so addicted to Nestorius after

<sup>a</sup> Nestoriani & menticios quasdam Theodoretis vulgare Epistolis, extat ex illis ad Nestorium inscripta ad finem 5. Actibus 5. Synodis. an. 436. nu. 10. <sup>b</sup> Pa. 558. b.

the union made, that hee thus writeth, *I say the truth unto you, I have often read them, and earnestly examined them, and I have found them to be free, (that is, full) in uttering hereticall bitterness; nor will I ever consent to those things which are unjustly done against you, nec si ambas manus, no though both my hands should bee cut off from me.* Thus writeth Theodoret in that Epistle which the holy Councell first, and after them we as firme and professe to have beene the true writing of Theodoret; and the same to be a counterfeit, a forgery, and none of Theodorets, but framed by heretikes, *Baronius* confidently avoucheth.

2. Now in this cause having the Synodall Acts, and with them the judgment of the whole generall approved Councell, on our side; wee might justly reject this as a calumny of *Baronius*, but for as much as hee not onely saith it, but undertakes to prove the same, wee will examine his reasons, that so the integrity and credit of these Acts maybe more conspicuous. His reasons are two. The first<sup>c</sup> is grounded on a testimony of *Leontius Scolaſticus*, who writeth<sup>d</sup> thus; *It is to bee knowne, that certaine letters of Theodoret and Nestorius are caried about, in which either of them doe lovingly embrace the other; sed fictitia sunt, but they are counterfeit, and deviled by heretikes, thereby to oppugne the Councell at Chalcedon; but Theodoret hated Nestorius, &c.* Thus *Leontius*: and the Card. adds<sup>e</sup> this, extat ex illis Epistolis una, one of those counterfeit Epistles written to Nestorius is extant in the fift Councell, neare the end of the fiftaſtion thereof.

<sup>c</sup> Bar. loco cit. <sup>d</sup> Leont. lib. de sect. Act. 4 extat tom 4. Bibl. S. Patrum Edit. 3. <sup>e</sup> Bar. loco citat: f Nam Leontius meminit Eulogij Episcopi Alexandrini lib. de sect. Act. 5. Gregorius vero et Eulogius aequales, et extat Epist. Greg. ad ipsum lib. 8. Epist. 376.

3. What if wee should except against *Leontius*, (though hee<sup>f</sup> bee as ancient as Pope Gregory) as a man not of sufficient credit? Or will the Card. thinke you, defend him, and take his testimony for sound and good payment? then farewell for ever the books of *Toby*, *Judith*,

g Leont. *Al.* 2.  
 h Magister Sac.  
 Palat. pa. 134.  
 primi tom. Indi-  
 cis Romæ editi,  
 an. 1607.  
 i Edit. 3. Bibl. S.  
 Patr. per Marg.  
 la Bigne. Paris.  
 an. 1610.  
 k Existerunt is-  
 temporibus duo  
 viri, Diodorus et  
 Theodorus  
 Mopsuestia; qui  
 universas literas  
 sacras com-  
 mentariis illu-  
 strabant. Leont.  
*Al.* 4.  
 l Nec ipsi viri  
 quisquam dubiū  
 aliquod eorum  
 reprehendebat.  
*Ibid.*  
 m Scripsi hac  
 prescribibus  
 multis Episcopis,  
 Archelao, Aprin-  
 gio, Theodoro, &c.  
 qui omnes  
 sui studiosissimi,  
 una mecum se  
 rogant, &c. sic  
 Ioh. an. Antio.  
 Nestorius. 10m. 1.  
 Conc. Eph. ca. 31.  
 n Ex schola  
 Theodori Mop-  
 suesteni erant  
 Nestorius, Theo-  
 doretus et alij,  
 factus viperini  
 dicendi. Bar. an.  
 4:7. nu. 26. et  
 Theodoretus o-  
 juscum planē  
 communionis  
 cum Theodoro  
 Mopsuesteo, cu-  
 jus adeo studiosus  
 extitit ut crede-  
 retur eum nomē  
 Theodoretū à  
 Theodoro deri-  
 vasse. *Ibid.* nu.  
 29.  
 o De amico au-  
 tem sciat tua  
 sanctitas. (vult  
 autem Nestori-  
 um) Epist. Theo-  
 doret. tom. 3.  
 Ephes. Conc.  
 Append. 2. ca. 9.  
 p Tom. 1. Eph.  
 conc. ca. 31.  
 q An. 431. nu.  
 47.

Wisdom, Maccabees, and Ecclesiastics; for Leontius reckoning the bookes of the old Testament to be twenty two, and expressly mention-  
 ing them all without these, saith, *Hi sunt libri, these are the bookes*, as  
 well of the old, as of the new Testament, which in the Church are  
 held for Canonical. I doubt the Card. will here say, that the case is al-  
 tered; In this hee speak against them and their Trent faith, not against  
 us: Here the note of their *Index expurgatorius* must bee embraced;  
 write, saith the Index, in the margent, *diminuit Catalogum texnit Leon-  
 tius, Leontius recites not fully the Catalogue of the sacred bookes*: And yet  
 note one memorable thing by the way, God who suffered not Laban  
 to speake an ill word against Iacob, and who turned the curses of Bala-  
 am into a blessing to Israell, the same God over-ruled their pen or  
 hands, as hee did once the tongue of Caiphas, and in stead of *diminuit  
 texnit*, they have uttered a Prophecy against themselves, printing even  
 in that edition which past through their Purgatorian fire of correcti-  
 on, *Divinitus Catalogum librorum divinarum texnit, Leontius hath reci-  
 ted this Catalogue by an heavenly inspiration*: and yet for all that *divini-  
 tus texnit*, the Cardinall will not beleeeve Leontius, whom against us he  
 perswades all men to beleeeve. But howsoever in other matters (as by  
 name in that Catalogue *texto divinitus*) Leontius is to bee beleeeved,  
 of a certainty hee is no fit witnesse in this cause of the *Three Chapters*;  
 Hee was too partiall, that I say not hereticall, in this point, too  
 much addicted to the writings of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and Theo-  
 doret; let Baronius himselfe say, whether his commending of Theodo-  
 rus Bishop of Mopsuestia, and Diodorus Bishop of Tarsis, for illustra-  
 ting the whole Scripture by their Commentaries, for being such  
 worthy men, as that no man while they lived, did reprove any one  
 saying of theirs, bee not untrue, and after, both the person of the one,  
 and writing of both condemned by the generall Councell, impious al-  
 so and hereticall. To come yet nearer to his saying concerning Theodo-  
 ret, in the very next sentence save one before those words which Baro-  
 nius alleageth Leontius saith, *Verum ne Theodoretum quidem constat un-  
 quam admisisse Nestorium*, it doth not appeare that Theodoret did ever admit  
 of Nestorius, or hold communion with him. Had not the Cardinall  
 skipt over (as is the wont of all heretikes) these former words of Le-  
 ontius, hee would have beene ashamed to alleage this testimony: For  
 not onely the Synodall acts of the Ephesine Councell, but the Car-  
 dinall himselfe often teacheth and proverh it by cleare evidence, that  
 Theodoret admitted Nestorius, and that into a neare band of friend-  
 ship, love, and communion. In that Epistle which Theodoret writ from  
 Chalcedon to Alexander, hee calleth Nestorius their friend, and saith of him,  
 while wee are here in this legacy to the Emperour,  
*non cessabimus omni virtute, ejus patris curam gerere*, wee will not cease  
 with all our power to take care for Father Nestorius, knowing that  
 wrong is done to him by wicked men. There is recorded a very  
 loving Epist. to Nestorius written by Iohn & other Eastern Bish. parti-  
 cularly by Theodoret, who all writ of themselves *sui studiosissimi*, we are  
 all most affectionate to Nestorius; of whom Baronius saith, they who  
 writ this to Nestorius, *eidem intima conjuncti necessitudine*, being joynd  
 in



in a most neare band of familiarity, stood afterwards for him in the Councell, *Maximè vero eidem addictus Theodoretus*, but of them all Theodoret was most addicted unto him. And againe<sup>r</sup>, having cited some words of Theodoret, he addeth, Seeing Theodoret saith thus, *Iam non solum cum Nestorio unanimem fuisse vides, sed dixerim etiam concorporeum*; you see that he was not only a loving friend, and of one minde, but, if I may so say, one incorporated, and concorporated to Nestorius. Thus Baronius, when himselfe so expressely contradicts his owne witnesse Leontius, and in this very cause touching Theodoret and Nestorius, yea, in that which is the ground of Leontius errorr touching this Epistle; should hee require us to beleeeve that which is but a collection from the former, which is his fundamentall errorr? may Baronius reject him in the former clause, must we embrace him in the next, which is but a dependant on the other? Leontius because hee thought; and thought erroneously, that Theodoret never embraced the friendship and communion with Nestorius, thought also erroneously this Epistle (which testifieth Theodorets love and communion with Nestorius) to bee a counterfeit; the Cardinall, who knoweth and professeth against Leontius, that Theodoret was most inward, and even almost incorporated to Nestorius, ought likewise to hold against Leontius, that this Epistle which testifieth such ardent affection to Nestorius, is the genuine and true Epistle of Theodoret.

4. And that every man may see the force of truth; and with what a feared conscience the Cardinall dealt in this cause, behold himselfe within few years after, against this testimony of Leontius, acknowledge, professeth, and sets downe this very Epistle as the true and certaine Epistle of Theodoret to Nestorius, which here no doubt, against his owne judgement and conscience hee denyeth; and poves out of Leontius not to bee the Epistle of Theodoret, but a counterfeit, and a forgery, for thus he writeth<sup>t</sup>, Theodoret indeed received the forme of faith sent from Cyrill, (as the time of the union) and subscribed unto it, but he could not so quickly forsake the friendship of Nestorius, whom hee had so long affected, for at this time (to wit after the union was made) hee writ an Epistle to Nestorius, which was read in the fift generall Synod; and then repeating every word of the Inscription and Epistle, hee adds at the end, *hætenus ad Nestorium Theodoretus*, thus writ Theodoret to Nestorius: and againe, Theodoret obstinately professed in his letters lately recited, that hee would never assent to the sentence against Nestorius. Thus Baronius, who hereby demonstrates himselfe to be a meere calumniator, who to disgrace the Synodal Acts of the fift Councell, affirms, and would seem by Leontius to prove that Epistle of Theodorets to bee none of his, but a forgery, which to bee no forgery but the true writing of Theodoret; himselfe knew, testifieth and professeth. Thus much of his former proove out of Leontius.

5. His other proove is taken<sup>t</sup> out of divers Epistles of Theodoret; specially out of that to Dioscorus Bishop of Alexandria, to Pope Leo, and divers others; and because it might bee replied, that these were written long after the time of the union, whereas, onely at that time, and somewhat after, Theodoret might bee said to have beene hereticall;  
and

<sup>r</sup> An. eccl. nu. 169

[An. 432. nu. 80  
81. et seq.

<sup>t</sup> Bar. an. 436;  
nu. 11.

and a favourer of *Nestorius*, as by this Epistle is signified: to wipe away this suspicion, he adds these words, *post initam quidem pacem*, truly after the peace and union once made with *Cyrill*, that ever after that time *Theodoret* was addicted to *Nestorius*, *Nulla prorsus est mentio*, there is no mention at all; but there are many monuments, that (since then) strenue asque impigre laboravit, that he laboured stoutly and diligently for the Catholiclike faith. To which purpose he againe saith<sup>u</sup>, *Post restitutam Ecclesia pacem*, after the peace and unity of the Church, *Theodoret* by all Catholikes was knowne to bee orthodoxall, and to communicate with those that were orthodoxall. Which orthodoxy of faith, saith hee<sup>r</sup>, those Epistles of his doe so abundantly testifie, that by them *plus satis absterfit*, he hath too much wiped away, purged and abolished all the blots and blemishes which he had contracted by his acquaintance with *Nestorius*. Thus *Baronius*, denying *Theodoret* at any time after the union made, to have beene hereticall, or a favourer of *Nestorius*; and then undoubtedly this Epistle, which both is hereticall, and wherein such entire love and affection is expressed to *Nestorius*, and which is recorded to have beene written after the time of the union, can be none of *Theodorets*, but must be rejected for an imposture, a forgery.

6. Doe you not verily beleieve the Cardinall had sent his wit out of the Country, when hee writ that whole part of his Annals, which concerns these three Chapters? A little before he professeth<sup>v</sup> this to be truly the Epistle of *Theodoret*, and now hee will prove that it was not, that it could not possible be the Epistle of *Theodoret*. Yea which is no lesse worthy of observing, hee before not onely allowed this Epistle, (with the inscription, wherein it was sayd that it was writ to *Nestorius* after the union) to be *Theodorets*; but he further sayth<sup>z</sup>, that *Theodoret* seemes to have beene of this minde, (which is noted in this Epistle) *etiam post concordiam*, even after the agreement, union, and concord made with *Cyrill*, seeing *Theodoret* so obstinately professeth in his letters, that hee would never assent to the sentence against *Nestorius*, *Sicque certum est aliquandiu perseverasse*, and so it is certaine that *Theodoret* continued some while (after the union) with an angry minde against *Cyrill*. But now hee will prove the quite contrary, that *Theodoret* for a certainty writ no such things, nor had any fellowship with *Nestorius* after the union. So both it is certaine that *Theodoret* writ this, and yet it is certaine he writ it not; certaine that hee writ it after the union, and yet certaine that he writ it not after the union. That is, to speake plainly, it is certaine the Cardinall demonstrates himselfe and his Annals to be false, untrue, and ridiculous, repugnant both to the truth, and to his owne writings.

7. This might suffice to oppose against whatsoever *Baronius* can produce. If he prove by any testimony this Epistle not to be *Theodorets*, I on the contrary will prove it to bee *Theodorets*, by the Cardinals owne testimony: If he prove by any reason *Theodoret* after the union not to have favoured *Nestorius* and his heresie; I on the contrary will prove that after the union hee favoured *Nestorius*, by a stronger reason, even by the Cardinals owne confession. If hee bring *Theodoret*, I bring *Baronius*, and so I might *Par pari referre*; quod male

*male mordet hominem.* But besides this confession of *Baronius*, (which disproves whatsoever he can prove against us in this matter) I will adde somewhat concerning those Epistles of *Theodoret*, on which hee much relyeth. Those Epistles coming out of the \* Vaticane (the very *Mini-house* of forgery) are in truth nothing else but counterfeits, as hereafter I purpose more fully to demonstrate; for this time I will onely mention that which most concernes this present cause, out of those Epistles which the Cardinall most urgeth, and those are his Epistles to *Dioscorus*, & to Pope *Leo*, specially seeing that to *Dioscorus* (as the Cardinall <sup>b</sup> tells us) declareth the faith of *Theodoret* to bee such and so orthodoxal, that it is enough, *ad abstergendum suspicionem*, so wipe away all suspicion of heresie, wherewith, by reason of some counterfeit writings in the Synod, (I thinke he meanes the fift Councell) hee was blamed: And indeed in those Epistles there is a plain condemning of the heresies of *Nestorius*, but first those Epist. were writ long after the union, and so cannot helpe the Cardinall at all in this point: and if they had beene writ presently upon that union, yet those not to bee truly *Theodorets*, divers circumstances doe make evident. In the Epistle to *Dioscorus* \* *Theodoret* is made to relate how long before that time hee had beene a Bishop, and where hee had preached. The yeares of his Bishopricke he reckons <sup>d</sup> to bee twenty six, all which time he continued a Preacher at *Antioch*. Whence *Baronius* \* observeth, *Theodoretum Episcopum publicum semper egisse Catechistam Antiochia*, that *Theodoret* being a Bishop, was continually the publike Catechist at *Antioch*, during that time of three Patriarchs, *Theodatus*, *Iohn*, and *Domnus*: And at least it might bee supposed that hee was a Preacher, or (as the Cardinall calls him) a Catechiser in that City, before hee was Bishop; another of those Epistles (that *ad Nonium* <sup>e</sup>) wil assure us the contrary, for there *Theodoret* saith of himselfe, I stayed in a Monastery, *quousque Episcopus factus, till I was made a Bishop*; And *Baronius* <sup>g</sup> further explaines this, saying, *creatus Episcopus*, after *Theodoret* was made and ordained Bishop, he was held at *Antioch* to be the preacher there, first by *Theodatus*; then by *Iohn* his successor: *Theodoret* goes on to set forth his owne orthodoxy and praise, saying <sup>h</sup>, that though hee so long continued a preacher at *Antioch*, yet in all those yeares, neither <sup>i</sup> any of the Bishops, nor any of the Clergy did reprove his doctrine or sayings; which hee explaines in that other Epistle <sup>k</sup> to Pope *Leo*, saying thus, *Whereas I have beene a Bishop these fixe and twenty yeares, yet in all this time, non subij quantumvis levem reprehensionem, I have not beene so much as lightly reprov'd for my doctrine, but by the favor of God I have delivered more than 1000 (or as *Baronius* <sup>l</sup> corrects it, more than ten thousand) soules from Marcionisme, Arianisme, Eunomianisme, so that in eight hundred Parishes (so many are in my Diocese of *Cyprus*) there hath not remained no not one weede but my flacke is free from all hereticall error.* Thus hee in that Epistle. Which his orthodoxy hee yet more fully declares in another Epistle <sup>m</sup>; *Looke on my writings both before and since the holy Ephesine Councell, in singulis qua edidimus operibus, Ecclesia sanus sensus & mens mihi conspicitur; in all and every one of my writings, the doctrine of the Church, and my sound*

a Epistolas Theodoretis (157. numero) Oras scriptas contra codex Vaticanus, etc. Bar. an. 430. nu. 48. b An. 449. nu. 20.

c Epistola ad Leonem scripta erat post Epistolam Laurentianum illud habetur an. 449. altera ad Dioscorum scripta est an. 454. ut ait Bar. illa an. nu. 18. at uero facta est an. 453. Bar. illa an. nu. 72. \* Extat apud Bar. an. 444. nu. 31.

d Sex annis ipse ego decessi tempore Theodosei illius tractatum ex tempore Johannis, presens hoc semel scriptum agitur an. quo quo Domnus sedet. E. 17. Theod. apud Bar. an. 444. nu. 23. e Epistola. f Extat apud Bar. an. 448. nu. 12. et 169. g An. 453. nu. 10.

h Epist. ad Dioscorum apud Bar. an. 444. nu. i Et usque bodie cum tantum tempus, prateritis nullus neque des. dilectorum Episcoporum, de qua piffimorum Clonorum, ea quo in me dista sunt, reprehendit aliquando, hnd. k Epist. Theod. l 13. extat apud Bar. an. 449. nu. 113. m An. 454. nu. 79.

in Epist. Theodoretis 61. addendum dnyre Episcopum apud Bar. an. 443. nu. 15. opinion



n Theodor. Epist.  
 81. apud Bar. an.  
 448. nu. 4.  
 o An. 444. nu.  
 18. Defuncto Cy-  
 rillo, sufficit est  
 hoc anno in locū  
 ipsius Dioscorus.  
 p Hoc eodem an-  
 no Theodoretus  
 Cyri creatus est  
 Episcopus; id  
 plane colliges ex  
 O. c. Bar. an.  
 423. nu. 10.  
 q Nam in ea E-  
 pist. (qua est  
 Theod. 113.)  
 narrat se injuste  
 in eo Concilio  
 Ephesino depo-  
 situm. apud  
 Bar. an. 444. nu.  
 118.  
 r Non hoc an.  
 (448.) sed se-  
 quenti. Epist. fi-  
 famosam babu-  
 tam esse Synodū,  
 certum est. Bar.  
 an. 448. nu. 58.  
 s In Notā suis  
 ad consiliab. E-  
 phes. pa. 1017. b.  
 t Viginti sex an-  
 nis Ecclesiam  
 rexit. Epist. The-  
 od. ad Leontium  
 apud Bar. an.  
 447. nu. 119.  
 quos ab an. 423.  
 incipiendo esse  
 necessario statuit  
 pro certo. Bar.  
 an. 423. nu. 10.  
 u an. 444. nu. 23

x Cum Theodo-  
 retus testatur se  
 anno 449. habere  
 in sede Episco-  
 palis annos 26.  
 utique in hunc  
 annum (423.)  
 necesse est revo-  
 cere sedis ejus  
 primordia. Bar.  
 an. 423. nu. 10.

opinion is conspicuous: And againe in that to *Nomus* speaking of the same his integrity of faith, in all these five and twenty yeares, saith he, *Nec à quoquam accusatus, nec quenquam accusavi*, Neither have I beene accused of any man, neither have I accused any. Thus is *Theodoret* made to write in those Epistles.

8. Let us omit the vanity and folly of the forgerer, who reports this as an honour to *Theodoret*; that hee even when hee was a Bishop, was a Catechiser for six and twenty yeares together, and that out of his owne Diocesse: that withall hee makes *Theodoret* boast of a most unlikely matter, that by his care and diligence (even during that his absence) he had so rooted all weeds of heresie out of his owne Diocesse; that *ne unum zizanium*, not so much as one weed remained, in all those eight hundred Parishes whereof he was Pastor. Doe but observe here two most palpable and ridiculous untruths of the forgerer. The former, that he makes *Theodoret* to write in the first yeare of *Dioscorus*, that is, as *Baronius* assures us, an. 444. that hee had then beene a Bishop six and twenty yeares. Now hee was created Bishop, as the Cardinall demonstrates, and sets downe for a certainty, An. 423. to which if you adde 26. I doubt not but any Arithmetician will easily shew it to be impossible that at the yeare 444. he shall be 26. yeares a Bishop. Nay see and deride the folly of this impostor. In the Epistle to *Leo* written after the Ephesine Latrociny, which the Cardinall, *Binius*, and all confesse to have beene An. 449. he makes *Theodoret*, account the whole time of his Bishopricke, to bee but twenty six yeares, which was so much when hee writ to *Dioscorus*, five yeares before that.

9. And here withall note by the way the rare wisdom of Cardinall *Baronius*. He upon that Epistle to *Dioscorus* sets downe this Memorandum, *Observa lector*, Note here gentle reader, that all these twenty six yeares Bishop *Theodoret* was a Catechist; and withall note how long each of those three Patriarches sate (to wit, six and twenty yeares) from the time that *Theodoret* was made Bishop, till this yeare 444. *Observa lector*, Note againe good reader, the dotage of the Cardinall. *Theodoret* was made Bishop An. 423. and by adding 26. the Cardinall cannot finde above 444. Truly it was fit he should be befuddled, who undertakes to defend Impostours, and most sottish untruths. But in the meane space doe you not thinke *Baronius* a very fit man to write Annals of 1200. yeares, that is so exact in calculating so small a summe, as to account 23. and 26. to make just 44. though at another time, when by such a false accompt he had no purpose to disgrace or refute the Acts of this Synod, he could then summe those particulars to make 49.

10. The other untruth which I mentioned is common to both these Epistles, and demonstrates them both to be counterfeits, or *Theodoret* if he writ them to be a most shamelesse lyer, and in these his writings of no credit at all. In all those 25. or 26. yeares, saith he, I was not accused, nor reproved: no not lightly reproved for my doctrine by any man. Not accused? not reproved? no not lightly reproved? Fye, both he and his doctrines were condemned and accursed for hereticall,

call, and before hee writ this to *Leo*, himselfe was deposed also from his Bishoprick in a generall Councell. Of all which there are undoubted evidences as cleare as the Sun. His impious and hereticall writings against *Cyrril*, and his twelve Chapters, so often recorded both in the first Councell, in the Imperiall Edict of *Iustinian*, in Pope *Gregory* and *Pelagius*, acknowledged by *Baronius* for impious and heretical, these being writ in the time of the holy Ephesine Councell directly in defence of Nestorianisme, and against the Catholike faith, did the doctrine of the Church shine in them? were not they reprov'd? not so much as lightly reprov'd? when the holy Ephesine Councell expressly condemned and accursed all the doctrines of *Nestorius*, and all who defend them: was this thinke you no reproofe of *Theodore*s his writings? There is extant among the acts of the Ephesine Councell, the decree which *John* a Bishop of Antioch made with the rest that tooke part with *Nestorius*, and which falsely called themselves the holy Synod of *Ephesus*, whereas they were nothing else but a meere conspiracy of detestable heretikes. In that decree they depose *Cyrril* and *Memnon* as being Apollinarians, heretikes, contemners of the holy Fathers and their doctrine, turbulent, seditious, and the like: they accurse all the rest of the Bishops who consented to *Cyrril*, that is, all who were of the holy Ephesine Councell; and they binde them with an *Anathema* so long, till they did accurse the twelve chapters of *Cyrril*, (that is, till they did renounce and accuse the Catholike faith, and maintaine Nestorianisme.) To this hereticall, false, slanderous, and diabolicall decree of the Nestorians, *Theodore*s subscribed by name among the rest. What thinke you now? Did *Theodore*s all this time accuse none? or was this decree to which he subscribed not accused? was it not reprov'd, not lightly reprov'd of any? Reade but the seventh Chapter of the fourth Tome of those acts<sup>b</sup>, and there you shall see that this their whole conventicle; and among the rest *Theodore*s is particularly condemned, and anathematized by the holy Oecumenicall Synod of *Ephesus*, for this their hereticall dealing: and I suppose this was some reproofe of *Theodore*s, to bee, and that most justly, condemned and excommunicated for an heretike by the consenting judgment of an holy Oecumenicall Synod; that is in truth by the whole Catholike Church. Those Acts of the Ephesine Councell containe 1000. like demonstrations of that untruth, uttered in those Epistles. Among them all consider but that Sermon<sup>c</sup> which *Theodore*s made to the Nestorians at *Chalcedon*, during the time of that Ephesine Councell, of which *Pelagius* sayth, *Theodore*s is carryed, *insano impetu*, with a furious rage against *Cyrril*, and the other Orthodoxall Bishops of the holy Councell, comparing them to Serpents, Basiliskes, murderers, and the like. Neither doth he onely vomit out his choler against them, but he plainly girded at the Emperour also. (Did he accuse none when he uttered all this?) Nay he<sup>d</sup> affirmes Catholikes which hold Christ God and man to be one person, and so to be passible, to be worse than Heathens. The Heathens, sayth he, taught, the Heaven, the Sun, and the Starrs to be impassible, and shall wee beleieve the onely begotten Son of God to be passible, and such as may dye? *Abfit Saluator, ne sic*

y Sancta Synodus, Parisiensis, condemnavit aliorum vaniloquentiam, quosquos vel post Nestorium, vel certe illum fuerit qui eadem sapient. Append. 1. ad tom. 2. Act. Ephes. Conc. ca. 6 pa. 679. a Tom. 3. Act. Eph. Conc. ca. 2. pa. 775.

b Pa. 797.

c Append. 5. ca. 3. ad tom. 6. Act. Conc. Eph. p. 907

d Theod. loc. cit.

simus

e Tom. 5. AB.  
Eph. Conc. ca. 5.  
pa. 231. & pa.  
237.

*simus Apostata*; farre be this from us, O Saviour, let us not be such *Apostates*, as to teach this, let us not suspect that our Saviour could suffer. Let any man now judge whether it be not a shamelesse untruth which those Epistles avouch that *Theodoret* was not reprov'd for this doctrine, no not lightly reprov'd in all those 26. yeares; whereas both then and ever since; the whole Catholike Church hath accursed his impiety and heresie, which he so insolently then preached? And omitting infinite like proofes of the falshood of that Epistle, the next yeare after the Ephesine Councell, there was a Synod<sup>e</sup> held at Antioch, where *John* and divers other Bishops concluded the full union with *Cyrill*, wherein they all condemne & anathematize the heresies of *Nestorius*, which their profession of faith; and this condemning of the Nestorian heresie, *John* sent, both to *Cyrill*; to Pope *Sixtus*, and to *Maximianus* Bishop of *Constantinople*. Now seeing *Theodoret* not only in former time had beene so violent and furious in defence of that doctrine, but then and long after continued in the same minde, was not his doctrine reprov'd, nay was it not accursed and anathematized by *John* Patriarch of *Antioch*, and many other Bishops subject to his Patriarchship? What a most vile and shamelesse untruth then is it, which the Impostor makes *Theodoret* to utter, that in the whole space of 25. or 26. yeares he neither accused any, nor was accused nor reprov'd; no not lightly reprov'd either by *John* or any other, but that all and every one of his writings, contained the true doctrine of the Church? But enough of those Epistles, which to be forged and false this which is already sayd may for this time suffice.

f Lib. 5. ca. 40.

11. Having now declared how untrue that is which *Baronius* affirmeth, that *Theodoret* after the union did never embrace the heresies of *Nestorius*, and withall seene how weake and unsound his prooffe is in this point, I will yet adde one consideration which will further manifest, and even demonstrate the same. That is taken from the history of *Theodoret*. Certaine it is, that when *Theodoret* writ that history, he was earnestly addicted to Nestorianisme, whereof in the very last Chapter<sup>e</sup> he gives an eminent prooffe, commending *Theodorus* Bishop of *Mopsuestia* for a worthy teacher of the whole Church, and for an oppugner of all heresies: adding, that whereas he was a Bishop thirty six yeares, he never ceased, *optimam herbam sanctis Christi ovibus suppeditare, to feed the flocke of Christ with the best herbes*. None can doubt but hee who so much extolleth so detestable an heretike, and approveth those most damnable heresies which from him *Nestorius* suckt, for the best herbes or doctrines, but he must needs be confessed to bee as deepe in Nestorianisme as *Nestorius* himselfe. If now it may appeare that this history was writ by him after the union, there can no doubt remaine but that after the union *Theodoret* favoured *Nestorius* and all his heresies.

gan. 427. nu. 28

12. *Baronius* knowing this inevitably to follow, to decline the whole force of this, tels<sup>s</sup> us that *Theodoret* writ his history not onely before the union, but before the jarre also; yea before the time of the holy Councell at Ephesus; whereof having given some sleights conjectures, in the end he concludes, *Dicendum est, It must be sayd that Theodoret writ this history in the*



the space of those three yeares which were next precedent to the holy Ephesine Councell. So he: Shall I say the Cardinall was deceived and overseene herein? No, I will not suspect that such an evident error could creepe into the minde of so exact an Annalist. I rather thinke his intent was, wilfully and wittingly to deceive others, and that therefore hee sayd this to smother that truth touching *Theodorets* continuance in Nestorianisme, which he elsewhere so often denieth. *Theodoret*<sup>h</sup> mentioneth in that his history the translation of the body or reliques of *Chrysostome*, and bringing them to *Constantinople*. The Cardinall was so far from being ignorant hereof, that himselfe citeth <sup>i</sup> *Theodoret* with a memorandum. He, *ante omnes*, above them all mentioneth this translation, but in few words. That translation, as *Socrates*<sup>k</sup> and *Marcellinus*<sup>l</sup> witnessse, was when *Theodosius* was the sixteenth time Confull, that is, as the Cardinall also accounteth, in the yeare 438. Now seeing the union betweene *Iohn* and *Cyrill* was made in the yeare 432. it unavoidably followeth; that either *Theodoret* writ not his History till seven yeares at least after the union; and how much more I know not, whether 8. 10. or 16. after it, (for it is uncertaine :) or if hee writ it, as the Cardinall divineth, before the Ephesine Synod, that he writ it prophetically, writing those Acts which happened not till eight or nine yeares after his history was written. The truth is, an orderly and historicall continuation of things done, he doth not write, but onely to the death of *Theodorus* Bishop of *Mopsuestia*, where his history (for any such continuation of succeeding matters) doth end: but to shew and testifie that he writ his history after the yeare 438. hee purposely mentioneth some of those acts which fell out in that yeare: and hereof further there may be a presumption, because *Theodoret*, as *Baronius* tels<sup>m</sup> us, followed *Sozomen* in his commending of *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*; now *Sozomen*s history was continued unto the 17. Consulship of *Theodosius*, as himselfe witnessse: So that if *Theodoret*, as the Cardinall tels us, tooke it out of *Sozomen*, and his booke was not published till the yeare 439. sure the Cardinall of all men had reason to think that *Theodoret* could not before that time (otherwise than prophetically in this point) write his history. It remaineth now, seeing *Theodoret* was an earnest defender of *Nestorius* at the time when he writ this history, and it was written after the yeare 438. that out of all doubt till then hee remained heretical; and devoted to all the blasphemies and heresies of *Nestorius* and *Theodorus*, which in that history he commendeth for most wholesome food, and Catholike doctrine.

11. But not to stay longer in a matter very cleafe, my conclusion of this former point is this; Seeing the Cardinall tels us that from the time of the union *Theodoret* was not onely a Catholike and orthodoxall Bishop, but that he did manfully fight for the Catholike faith, it evidently followeth, that in the Cardinals judgment, Nestorianisme and those herbes, nay most poysonfull weeds of *Theodorus* are Catholike doctrines, seeing as now we have proved for many (but of a certainty for seven yeares at least) after the union, that doctrine which *Theodoret* embraced, and so earnestly defended, was no other than the

<sup>h</sup> Lib. 5. biff.  
Ecc. ca. 36.

<sup>i</sup> Bar. an. 438.  
nu. 6.

<sup>k</sup> Lib. 7. ca. 44.

<sup>l</sup> In suo Chron.

<sup>m</sup> Ecquid mirum, si quod dixit Sozomenus, à Theodoro repetitum inveniat. Bar. in Martyr. Rom. Decemb. 23.

blasphemous heresies of *Nestorius* and *Theodorus*. And let this suffice for the third addition, which he unjustly objecteth to the Acts of this fifth Councell.

## CAP. XXXIV.

The fourth addition to the Synodall Acts, pretended by *Baronius*, for that the Epistle of *Theodoret*, intituled to *Iohn* Bishop of Antioch, is falsely inserted therein; refuted.



1. Is fourth instance concernes an Epistle of *Theodoret*, inscribed to *Iohn* Bishop of Antioch, set downe neare the last end of the fifth Collation; wherein *Theodoret* exceedingly rejoyceth for the death of *Cyrrill*. In handling whereof, *Baronius* and *Binius* doe more than triumph, as if the field were certainly wonne. That Epistle, sayth *Binius*<sup>a</sup>, *nequissimi & scelestissimi alicujus nebulonis Eutychniani commentum est*, is the forgery of some most naughty and nefarious Eutychnian varlet, and by fraud and surreption is thrust into the Acts of this Synod. We have before discovered, saith *Baronius*<sup>b</sup>, the imposture of that Epistle, but we are not grieved to repeat the same things here againe, that it may be shewed that they are not the true Acts of the Synod, sed *nebulonis cujusdam ex cogitatione commentum*, but a forgery devised by some knave: and therefore we say, that Epistle which is recited under the name of *Theodoret* to *Iohn* of Antioch, *Omni ex parte convinci*, is every way convinced not to bee *Theodoret's*. Again<sup>c</sup>, There is an Epistle set downe in the fifth Synod, under the name of *Theodoret*, written unto *Iohn*, rejoycing in the death of *Cyrrill*, and babbling very many things against him, which you may more truly call a Satyre, or infamous libell, than an Epistle. And we take it very indignely that it should goe under the name of *Theodoret*, which is rather the figment of some *Nestorian*: and againe<sup>d</sup>, it is *figmentum impudentissimi cujusdam nebulonis*, a fiction of some most shameles varlet. Thus & much more *Baronius*. The like doth *Binius* with no lesse confidence and virulency against these Acts affirme. The maine ground on which they both relye, is, for that *Iohn* Bishop of Antioch to whom this Epistle is inscribed, was dead before *Cyrrill*. How could *Theodoret*, saith *Baronius*<sup>e</sup>, write to *Iohn* touching the death of *Cyrrill*, seeing *Iohn* was dead seven yeares before *Cyrrill*? which, saith he, *exploratum habetur*, is sure and certaine, both by *Nicephorus* and others who writ the succession of Bishops, as also by an Epistle which *Cyrrill* writ to *Domnus* the successour of *Iohn*, both which proofes *Binius*<sup>f</sup> also alledgeth.

2. My first answer hereunto is, that if this bee a demonstration of forgery, because an Epistle is written to one that is dead, themselves, and not we, shall be the greatest losers hereby. There is a decretall Epistle written by Pope *Clement* to *Iames* Bishop of *Ierusalem*, and bro-

<sup>a</sup> Annot. in 5. Concil. S. Constitutum.

<sup>b</sup> an. 553. nu. 43

<sup>c</sup> Bar. an. 444. nu. 12.

<sup>d</sup> an. 553. nu. 44.

<sup>e</sup> an. 444. nu. 16  
<sup>f</sup> an. 553. nu. 44.

<sup>g</sup> Loco citato.

<sup>g</sup> Epist. 1. Clem. extat. to. 1. Conc. pa. 25. & seq.

brother of our Lord: in that Epistle the Pope tels Iames, how Peter being now ready to bee martyred, tooke Clement, ordained him Bishop, gave him the keyes, set him in his owne chayre, and when hee was set therein, sayd unto him, *Deprecor te O Clemens, O Clement I beseech thee* before all that are here present, that thou write unto Iames the brother of our Lord, how thou hast beene a companion with me of my journeyes, and of my actions, *ab initio usque ad finem*, from the beginning to the end; and write also what thou hast heard mee preach in every City, what order of words, of actions, I have used in my preaching, and also what an end I make of my life in this City. Neither feare that he will be sory for my death, seeing he will not doubt but I dye for pieries sake; yea it will be a great comfort unto him, to heare that I doe not leave my charge to one that is ignorant or unlearned. According to this request and command of Peter, Clement writ an Epistle to Iames, exhorting him, that he command all that which Peter taught, to be diligently observed. This and much more writ Clement to Iames after the death, and of the life and death of Peter. Now Iames unto whom hee writ was dead sixe or seven yeares before Peter: For Iames was slaine in the seventh, and Peter in the thirteenth yeare of Nero, as out of S. Ierome<sup>h</sup>, Eusebius<sup>i</sup>, Iosephus<sup>k</sup>; and others, is evident; and as Baronius<sup>l</sup>, and after him Binius<sup>m</sup>, not onely professe but clearly and rightly prove: and because this is a decretall<sup>n</sup> Epistle, an Apostolicall<sup>o</sup> writing, sent from Clement being Pope, which was not till the tenth<sup>p</sup> yeare of Domitian, and that is thirty yeares after the death of Iames, it hence ensueth that it was writ to Iames thirty yeares after he was dead. What shall now become of this decretall and Apostolicall Epistle? Will they be content that by the Cardinals demonstration it bee rejected as the forgery of some leud varlet? Fye! By no meanes. Binius<sup>r</sup> calls it the Epistle of Pope Clement; Baronius<sup>s</sup> tels us that it is not only Pope Clements, but that this and the other written to the same Iames the dead Bisnop of Ierusalem, are *integra & illibata*, intire and incorrupted writings of Clement. In their Canon law<sup>t</sup>, and that corrected by the Pope, it is stiled the epistle of Pope Clement to Iames: and that which is there related must stand for the words and doctrine of S. Peter<sup>u</sup>, yea the authority of it, as other decretall Epistles, *Conciliiorum<sup>x</sup> Canonibus pari jure exequatur*, is every way equall to the Canons of Nice, of Chalcedon, of other holy Councils. If that bee too little, what Saint Austen<sup>y</sup> sayth of the very sacred Canonickall Scriptures, indited by the Spirit of God himselfe, that doth Gratian (wretchedly abusing Saint Austens words) apply to this and the rest of the Popes decretall Epistles, saying of them<sup>z</sup>, *Inter Canonicas Scripturas, decretalles Epistolae connumerantur*; the decretall Epistles are to be reckoned among the Canonickall Scriptures. Bellarmine<sup>a</sup> not onely in generall defends this saying of Gratian, telling us that the decretals may well be called Canonickall, that is, either such as are a rule, and have force to binde; or Canonickall in that sense as the seventh Synod calleth the Decrees of Councils, *Constitutions* inspired from God; but particularly also

<sup>h</sup> Hic Iacobus 30. annis rex Ecclesiam, usq; ad septimum Neronis annum. Hier. in Catal. scrip. in Iacobo, Petrus ad ultimum annum Neronis, id est, 14. Ecclesiam rexit, idem in Petro.

<sup>i</sup> Euseb. an. 7. Neronis ait Iacobum occisum, an. Christ. 63. Petrus an. 14. Neronis idem an. 70.

<sup>k</sup> Ioseph. Iacobus lapidatus ait an. post Christum natum 63. Antiqu. lib. 20. c. 8. 1 Anno 7. Neronis, Iacobi necem accidisse omnes consentiunt. Bar. an. 63. an. 3. Petrum autem anno 13. Neronis occisum probat. Bar. an. 69. nu. 2.

<sup>m</sup> Annot. in Epist. 1. Clem. n Inter Decretales epistolas Pontificum numerat eam Turrian. lib. 2. ca. 13. & hoc probat. p. 109 o Apostolicum Pontificum. Tur. lib. 2. in pref. pa. 150. et sua authoribus, id est Apostolicis, dignissimas. ibid. pa. 152.

<sup>p</sup> Clementem ingressum in Papatum an. Chr. 93. is est Domitianus an. 10. probat Baron. an. 93. nu. 2. q Nam à obijt (ut probatum est) an. Chr. 63. 1 Epistola 1. Clement. Papae. An. 103. nu. 6. Clementis Papae.

ad Iacobum Epist. 1. Distinct. 80. ca. 2. sic iterum Caus. 6. q. 1. ca. 5. u Petrus in ordinatione Clementis. Caus. 11. q. 3. ca. 11. attendite sermoni istius, qui nobis per B. Clementem recitatur. Nicb. 1. Epist. 49. et beatus Petrus prohibebat. Caus. 6. q. 1. ca. 5. z Dist. 20. ca. Decretal. y Lib. 2. de doct. Christ. ca. 8. z Dist. 19. ca. 6. a Lib. 2. Cons. ca. 12.



b *Ruffinus* me-  
minit epistola  
Clementis ad  
Iacobum, et eam  
se vertisse dicit  
ex Græco. Bell.  
lib. 2. de Pont.  
Rom. ca. 14. §.  
Ad hec.

c Tu consule Tur-  
rianum. Bar. an.  
102. nu. 6.

d Cuius fidei  
sint hæ Clementis  
epistola. Vide  
Turrianum. Bin.  
notis in Epist. 1.  
Clem. pa. 31.

e Defens. ca. 14  
lib. 2. de Pont.  
Rom. §. Altera.  
f Turri. pro epist.  
Pontificum. lib.  
2. pref. pa.  
152.

g Omni gravi-  
tate, doctrinâ et  
sanctitate refer-  
tas. ibid.

h Pref. ead. m.  
pa. 150. 151.

i Lib. eodem. 2.  
ca. 13. pa. 215.

k Ca. 13. lib. 2.  
l Si Clementis  
germanam epi-  
stolam hanc esse  
dixerimus (ut  
Bar. ipse ait. an.  
102. nu. 6.) falso  
inscripta est, et  
ad Simeonem po-  
tius tunc Hiero-  
solytorum Epi-  
scopum, quam ad  
Iacobum longe  
antea defunctum,  
scripta fuit. Bar.  
an. 69. nu. 43.

m Poss. in Cle-  
mente, in suo  
apparatu.

n Hac epistola  
potius ad Sime-  
onem qui etiam  
frater Domini dicitur, scripta est: & in titulum epistola mandose, vox (Iacobum) irrepfit. Bin. notis in epist. 1. Clem. p. 110. 112. pa. 211.

o Quid coegit eam et imprudentia delabi, ut ad eum scribere Clementem manderet Petrus, quam ipse scribat jam mortuum. ibid. pa. 208.

p Hæc tibi frater Iacobi ab ore sancti Petri accepi, tibi insonare studui, ut seruari omnia immaculate præcipias. Epist. Clem. in fine.

q Causa gravissima scribendi ad Iacobum jam mortuum fuisse Petri, de doctrinâ ad omnes Episcopos pertinente. Turri. loc. cit. pa. 211.

r Ita cerit est ut isti dicunt, non potuisse igno-  
rare Petrum fuisse jam ante annos 8. Iacobum mortuum. ibid. pa. 208.

s Causa gravissima scribendi per transigentatio-  
nem. pa. 211.

t Simile exemplum in alijs eiusdem Clementis libris cernitur. In utroque est quædam filio seu inductio  
persona quod genus totam ad imitationem personarum pertinet. ibid. pa. 212. Vtrobique est imitatio personarum. pa. 213.

y Si ad ullam aliquem vivorum scripsisset, videretur magis eum diligere aut honorare, & emulationis, vel invidia materiam  
præbuisse: Anne parvi momenti hæc cautio? Quis tam obtusus sit, ut sic sanctus? ibid. pa. 211.

z Cum Po-  
sthumus mandaret Clementi ut ad Iacobum mortuum scribat clarissimum testimonium reformationis præberet. ibid. pa. 212.

he defends<sup>b</sup> by the authority of *Ruffinus* this to be the true Epistle of Pope *Clement* unto *Iames*: and to omit others, their Iesuite *Turrian*, to whom *Baronius*<sup>c</sup>, *Binius*<sup>d</sup>, *Gretzer*<sup>e</sup>, and others, refer us for the credit of these Epistles, hath writ a whole booke in defence of them; wherein he calls them (and particularly he mentioneth and defendeth this of *Clement* to *Iames*) *sanctissimas*<sup>f</sup>, *verissimas*, &c. most holy, most true Epistles, most worthy of their authors; that is, men Apostolike, consecrated by the reverence of the whole world, full of all gravity, learning and sanctity, confirmed by the testimony and use of all ages: and which is most worthy remembring for our present purpose, the Iesuite writes in defence of them thus<sup>g</sup>, *What if in these Epistles sometimes there meet us some such matters as are not easie to all? must wee therefore doubt of their authority? by no meanes.* Therefore if any man doe not understand how the Epistle of *Clement* could bee written to *Iames* the brother of our Lord, who was dead more than eight yeares before, such an one, if he be a learned, modest, and temperate man, he will ask of others, and in the meane space containe himselfe within his owne bounds; that is, as himselfe explaineth, handling this Epistle<sup>h</sup>, he must so firmly hold it to be written by Pope *Clement*, *ut dubitare nefas existimet, that he esteems it a great sinne to doubt thereof.* Besides all this, the Iesuite hath a large Chapter<sup>k</sup> purposely to defend and shew this Epistle to be truly *Clements*, though it was written to *Iames* long after he was dead. Some there were (whom *Baronius*<sup>l</sup>, *Posservine* and *Binius* follow) who thought it was written indeed by *Clement*, but not unto *Iames*, who was then dead, but unto his successor *Simeon*. Against these their owne *Turrian* holds resolutely<sup>p</sup> that it was writ not to *Simeon*, nor to any but to *Iames*; and whereas some would think it a folly<sup>q</sup> and madnesse to write to such an one as was dead, and which was knowne to be dead to the author who writ it, (for who should be the carier of this letter unto him?) especially to write unto him as a governour in the Church militant, & to instruct and exhort<sup>r</sup> him what he should carefully observe, *Turrian* tels<sup>s</sup> you that there were divers great and waighy reasons why Saint *Peter* commanded *Clement*, and why *Clement* did write this to a dead man, whom they both knew to be dead: and having given divers very wise and worthy reasons hereof, one taken from transfiguration<sup>u</sup>, another<sup>x</sup> from imitation, a third from avoyding<sup>y</sup> hatred, if he had writ to any that had beene alive; a fourth<sup>z</sup>, for to be a testimony of the Resurrection, (belike because that Saint *Iames* shall then reade this holy Apostolicall Epistle, and see what

godly exhortation and advice for government of the Church Clement gives unto him :) and such like ; in the end he concludes <sup>p</sup>, that such as are Catholikes must not doubt <sup>q</sup> of the truth of this Epistle, though they know not the reason why it was written to a dead man: and with all, that with men who have reason and judgement, *certum esse debet*; such must assure themselves that both S. Peter and Clement had and knew reasons why the one commanded to write, and the other did write unto a dead man. Whereas now the Cardinals worthy demonstration? Had hee and *Binias* beene men of reason and judgement, and considered (as no doubt but they read) that tract of *Turrian*, (seeing unto it they referre us) they might have scene therein divers reasons why *Theodoret* might write to *John*, though he were dead; for every one of *Turrians* reasons is as forcible to defend this Epistle of *Theodoret*, as they are to excuse *Clement*, for writing to *James*, who was dead long before: But the case is now altered, the Cardinals demonstration holds onely in those writings that distaste him, or make for us, and against their cause. But *si in rem sint*, if any such writing bring (as all the decretals doe) either honour to the Romane See, or gaine to the Romane Court, though they were writ to one that was dead, I say not seven, but seven times seven yeares before, they shall bee honoured as the true and undoubted writings of the authors.

3. Let mee adde but one other example, but that is such an one as doth cut all the sinewes; yea, the very heart-strings of the Cardinals demonstration. The translation of *Chrysostomes* body or reliques by *Theodosius* the younger, more than thirty yeares after his death, from *Comana*, where hee dyed in banishment, to *Constantinople*, is a matter so testified by *Socrates*, *Theodoret*, *Marcellinus*, the great *Menology*, their Romane Martyrology, and others, that we doe not doubt of the truth thereof; But since it is retranslated, as they say, from *Constantinople* to *Rome*, the onely shop indeed to utter all such ware, and make the people goe a whoring after them: That those his supposed reliques may be have in reverence, it is worthy the considering, how miraculously they had made the manner of his Translation. *Nicophorus* relates the summe of it; but, as by *Baronius* it seemes, he borrowed it out of the luculent Oration of one *Cosmas Festianus*, whether one of the Vatican, or a Baronian author I know not, but so ignoble, and so unworthy an author, that *Possevine* judged him not worthy to be named in his Bibliotheca; or reckoned among his *reses veritatis*. Out of this Tailors Oration hath the Cardinall stitched a very pretty Anile, the summe whereof is this: *Proculus* on a time making a panegyricall Oration in the praise of *Chrysostome*, the people were so flamed with the love and longing desire after him, that they interrupted the Bishop, and would not suffer him to make an end of his Sermon, crying out with many loud vociferations, they would have *Chrysostome*, *Chrysostome* and his reliques they would have: *Proculus* moved herewith, intreates the Emperour, the Emperour, at this their earnest suite sent divers Senators (some say an army together, with Clerks and Monks) to bring with all pompe the body of *Chrysostome* from *Comana*, thither they goe, and come to the place where *Chryso-*

p Catholici vero si quis sint, &c. pa. 215.  
q Etiam si unde, aut quomodo ad nos profecta sint nesciamus, tam propter antiquorum auctoritatem, tam teneamus, ut de eis dubitare nefas esse existimemus. Ibid.

r Lib. 7. ca. 44.  
s Lib. 4. ca. 36.  
t in suo Chron. an. 438.  
u Die 27. Janu.  
x Die 27. Janu.  
y Inde postea Roman translatum est. Martyr. Rom. Ibid.  
z Lib. 1. ca. 43.  
a Recitat idem. Cosmas literatus a quibusdam Nicophorum exscripsisse. Bar. an. 438. m. 8.  
b Baronius eundem (Cosma) sermonem in nostra Bibliotheca descripsit. Bar. an. in Martyr. Rom. Jan. 27. ad an. 438. m. 7.  
c An. 438.  
d Missi erant iam militum ad eum clericum Georg. Patriarch. Alex. in vita Chrysostomi fol. 77.

b In theca ar-  
gentea, sacra to-  
banis pignora  
asseruamus, ut  
inde ea auferre  
et de ferro conan-  
tibus, nemine,  
resistente mini-  
mo concessum  
fuit, yesse  
frustra tentata.  
Bar. an. 438. nu. 8  
c Sacro corpore  
in Bar. filio, loco  
inbarecente et  
immobili perma-  
nente. Ibid.  
d Imperatoris  
sententia ab om-  
nibus aqua pro-  
bata atque lau-  
data fuit. Ibid.  
e Johanni, auri  
oris Patriar-  
chie. Nic. lo. cit.  
et, At tu pater  
patrum, &c. lb.

f Precatus est, ut  
tumuli ejus mo-  
tus atq; strepitus  
cessaret, & e-  
nim annis jam in-  
quiescebat.  
Bar. ibid. nu. 12.

g Ipse Chryso-  
stomus labijs ror-  
sum apertis, ad  
populum dixisse  
ferunt, Pax vo-  
bis, Coloman apud  
Bar. loco citat.  
et Nicoph.  
h Idem cum  
stantes homines  
et Patriarcha  
Proclus, & alii  
se, testati sunt,  
Cof. et Nicoph.  
loc. cit.  
i Ad optimum  
quem g. lecto-  
rum magister  
Carthusianus post  
viam Chryso-  
stomum, apud  
Geor. pat.  
Alon.

stomes body was kept in a silver Coffin: Once, againe<sup>b</sup>, and very often they assay, yea, labor & strive with all their strength, with all their skill to lift up the Coffin, all was in vaine, the sacred body<sup>c</sup> was more im- moveable than a rock; they certifie this news to the Emperour, who cal- led *Proclus*, & other holy men to advise further about that matter; in the end the resolution of them all<sup>d</sup> was, that the Emperour *Theodosius* should write a Letter to *Chrysostome*, *Supplicis instar libelli*, in forme of a supplication, asking him forgiveness for the sinnes which *Arcadius* his father had committed against him, & *humilibus precibus*, to beseech him with most lowly prayers that hee would returne to *Constantinople*, and take his old See againe, praying him that hee would no longer by his absence afflict them, being so desirous of his body, yea, of his ashes, yea, of his shadow. The Emperour did so, the forme of whose letter of supplication out of the Tailor *Cosmas*, first *Nicephorus*, and then *Baronius* expresse, though the Cardinall for good cause was loath to give *Chrysostome* the title of a Patriarke, and *Pater Patrum*, which *Nicephorus* sets downe, those either the Tailor or the Cardinall con- cealeth or altereth. The Emperours letters were sent and brought to the dead corps, and with great reverence laid upon the brest and heart of *Chrysostome*, and the next day the Priests with great ease took up the body, and brought it to *Constantinople* into the Church of the holy Apostles. There first (as out of *Nicephorus* the Cardinal relateth) the Emperour with the people, *supplex communem precationem pro Pa- rentibus fecit*, made an humble prayer for his Parents, and more specially entreated for his Mother, that her grave<sup>e</sup>, which had shaken and been sicke of a palse, and made a noise and ratling for thirty five yeares to- gether might now at length cease; & the holy man heard the request, granted it; the graves palse was cured, so that it shaked no more. Then *Proclus* the Bishop placed dead *Chrysostome* in eundem Tombum, in the very same See and Episcopall seat with himselfe, all the people applauding and crying, O Father *Chrysostome* receive thy See; and then by a miracle beyond the degree of admiration, the lips<sup>f</sup> of *Chry- sostome* (five and thirty yeares after hee was laid in his grave) opened and blessed all the people, saying, *Pax be to you*; and this both the Pa- triarke *Proclus*, and the people standing by, testified<sup>g</sup> that they heard. Thus farre the Cardinals narration out of his Tailor *Cosmas* and *Nicephorus*.

4. Say now in earnest, is not this a story able to put downe *Heliodore*, *Orlando*; and all the fictions of all the Poets? their wits are barren, their conceits dull, they are all but very borchers to the Cardinall Taylor. It is not my purpose to stand now to refute such a lying legend: The Cardinals friends may see the censure which their Cath- olician Monke *Tilmannus* gives of it and of *Nicephorus*, the onely au- thor that he knew, till *Baronius* pull'd this blinde Tailor out of a cor- ner; Though I beleeeve (saith hee) God to be omnipotent, yet I be- leeeve not all which is here written of *Chrysostomes*, *sed si de pines lectore* esyles the reader choise whether hee will beleeeve it or not, for the writers of mens lives, who lived before *Nicephorus*, (and hee it is about the yeare 1328) would not have concealed or smothered in silence, re-  
tami



tant moment, a matter of so great moment. Thus the Carthusian, whose judgement may justly be thought to be the more weighty, because of all the ancient Fathers there is none (I speake it confidently) who hapned to have more fabulous writers than are *Palladius* (as he is called) *Leo* and *George* the writers; or rather the devisers of *Chrysostomes* acts, his life and death. Any one of them doting after such miraculous reports, would have painted out this miracle of miracles, with all the wit and words which they had: That which I onely observe is the strange, and if you please, miraculous lewd dealing of *Baronius*. This Epistle of *Theodosius*, though it was written to *Chrysostome* more than thirty yeares after his death, the Cardinall approves, applauds, and for a rare monument hee commends it, and all that appendant fable to all posterity. Why? it is an excellent story indeed to perswade the adoration of reliques, invocation of Saints, prayers for the dead, and such like. Had this Epistle of *Theodoret* contained such stuffe, it should have had every way the like applause from his Cardinallship; because it wants such matters, and crosseth in very many things the Cardinalls Annals, Oh it is nothing but a fiction, and a very forgery of some lewd naughty varlet. It is demonstrated to be such, because it was written to *Iohn* Bishop of *Antioch*, who was dead but 17. yeares before, whereas more than foure times seven yeares, cannot hinder the Epistle of *Theodosius* written to the Bishop of *Constantinople* after hee was dead, to be an authentike and undoubted record. This may serve the Cardinall for the first answer, who is now bound in all requisy, either to confesse his owne demonstration to be fallacious, or to proclaime the Epistle of Pope *Clement*, and the other of *Theodosius* with that whole narration, to be fictitious, and his owne Annals a fabulous legend.

5. My second answer is, that though *Iohn*, to whom this Epistle is directed, was dead, yet that proves onely the title or inscription to be amisse; or that *Theodoret* writ not this Epistle to *Iohn*; it cannot prove (which the Cardinall undertooke to doe) that the Epistle is forged, and not written by *Theodoret*. For the Epistle it selfe, so be it by *Theodoret*, his owne Sermon publicly preached at *Antioch* before *Domnus* after the death of *Cyrill*, and mentioned in the Synodall Acts next after this Epistle, doth clearly manifest, for the scope and purpose of that sermon is the same which is expressed in alle Epistles. In the Epistle *Theodoret* declareth his eagernesse in defending the doctrine of *Nestorius*, and withall rejoyceth and instructeth *Cyrill* being dead, who was then the chiefe opposer of the heresies of *Nestorius*. The very same eagernesse for *Nestorianisme*, and love to his heresies, as also the like joy for *Cyrills* death doth his sermon expresse avowedly, saying, *Nemo meminemus iam esse blasphemum, non iam dicitur* (Seeing *Cyrill* is dead) *compellit any man to blasphemy* (to heretisme the Catholike faith) Where are those (to wit *Cyrill*) who teach that *God was crucified*? It was the man *Christ*, and not *God* who was crucified: It was the man *Iesus* that dyed, and it was *God* the Word who raised him from the dead. *Non iam est contentio illius* (Seeing *Cyrill* is dead) *there is no contention*; *Oriens & Egyptus sub una jugo sunt*, the East & Egypt

1. Concione m. il.  
lam rati, tibi so-  
re chariorem.  
Bar. an. 438. nu.  
2. Cosmas vestia-  
rius luculentia  
oratione de eade  
translatione ba-  
bita que gesta  
fuerunt ex aliis  
recesset. Ibid.  
nu. 7. et c. 15. 16.  
miliababes.

1 Conc. Coll. 5. 5.  
pa. 559. b.

(that

(that is, as well those who are under the Patriarke of *Alexandria*, as they who are under the Patriarke of *Antioch*) are all under one yoke; that is, all submit themselves to one faith, that is, to Nestorianisme. *Mortua est invidia, & cum eo mortua est contentio*; Envy (hee meaneth *Cyrril*, who so much hated and oppugned the doctrine of *Nestorius*) is now dead, and all contention is dead and buried with him. Let now the *Theopaschites*, (hee meanes Catholikes, who taught God to have suffered and dyed) let them now bee at quiet. Thus preached *Theodoret* after the death of *Cyrril*, insulting over him being dead, triumphing that now (seeing *Cyrril* was dead) Nestorianisme did and would prevail. Who can imagine, but that the Epistle, maintaining the same heresie insulting in the same triumphing manner at the death of *Cyrril*, was written by *Theodoret*, when he publicly in his sermon before a Patriarke, uttered the same matter. Would *Theodoret* feare or forbear to write that in a letter, which hee neither did feare, nor could forbear to professe openly in a sermon; and that in so solemne a place and assembly? or was *Theodoret* orthodoxall, and a lover of *Cyrril* in his writings before the death of *Cyrril*, who was hereticall, and so full with the dregs of Nestorianisme after the death of *Cyrril*, that he must vent them, and with them disgorge his malice and spite against *Cyrril* in an open Pulpit, and in the hearing of a Patriarke, and all the people of *Antioch*? It is not the inscription on title of the Epistle, but the Epistle it selfe which the fift Councell and wee after it doe stand upon. Had not they knowne the Epistle to bee *Theodorets* they needed not by it to have proved that *Theodoret*, after the union, yea, after the death of *Cyrril* was eager, violent, yea, virulent also in defence of the heresies of *Nestorius*; that his publike sermon by them cited and preached after *Cyrrils* death, and against *Cyrril*, had beene a sufficient prooffe and demonstration of that; but because they were sure this was the true Epistle of *Theodoret*, they thought good to testifie that he was in writing the selfe same man as hee was in preaching, that is in both a spitefull maligner of *Cyrril*, in both a malicious and malignant Nestorian, and that long after the union made betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrril*, yea, that even after the death of *Cyrril* he continued both to write and to speake the same.

6. Observe now by the way the fraudulent dealing of *Baronius* and *Binius* in this cause. This passage taken out of a sermon publicly preached at *Antioch* against *Cyrril*, and in an insulting manner for his death, this they doe not, nor durst they carpe at it. It is testified by all the Bishops of the fift Councell to have beene a part of *Theodorets* sermon: the Epistle which likewise is testified by them all to bee *Theodorets*, containing the same matter with his sermon, that they galle at, and revile both it and the writer of it, because in the inscription thereof they have espyed an errour. It had beene honest dealing in the Cardinall and *Binius*, seeing these are fathers of one wing, either to have acknowledged both, or denyed both to bee the brood of *Theodoret*.

7. Againe, the Cardinall undertooke to prove, that still after the union betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrril*, *Theodoret* was a Catholike, and defen-

der of the Catholike faith, and because the Epistle demonstrates the contrary, he will not allow it to bee *Theodoret's*, but a forgery written in his name. Admit it were, yet that part of *Theodoret's* sermon is truly his, nor doth eyther *Baronius* or *Binius* deny it to bee his. Now by this sermon is *Theodoret* as effectually proved and demonstrated, as by the Epistle to have beene an eager oppugner of the Catholike faith, and an obstinate defender of all the heresies of *Nestorius* after the death of *Cyrril*, which was twelve<sup>m</sup> yeares after the union: So that although the Epistle were not *Theodoret's*, or had never beene extant, yet the Cardinals position for *Theodoret's* Orthodoxy is clearly and certainly refuted by the sermon of *Theodoret* made twelve yeares after the union.

m Vnio facta  
an. 432. Bar. illo  
an. 437. Cyril-  
lus autem obiit  
an. 444. Bar. il-  
lo an. 449.

8. Further yet the Cardinall to defend the Orthodoxy of *Theodoret* urgeth strongly, and relyeth upon the Epistles, which in their Vaticane or Mint-house are stamped with the name of *Theodoret*; whereas if there were no other proofes, this one sermon of *Theodoret's* is an undoubted evidence that they can bee none of *Theodoret's*, but are forged in his name; for the whole scope, at which those Epistles ayme, is to magnifie *Theodoret* both for his integrity of life, uprightnesse in judgement, laboriousnesse in preaching, and specially for his soundnesse in the Catholike faith, that he was never reprov'd nor accused by any, no not in fixe and twenty yeares, for his doctrine; that he never accused any, and specially for *Cyrril*; that *Theodoret* loved and honoured him for a learned and pious man, & mirificē coluit ejus memoriam, when *Cyrril* was dead, hee wonderfully honoured his memory, calling him a man of blessed memory; all which and a hundred such like matters contained in those Epistles are undeniably convicted to bee untrue by this sermon of his, wherein he vomiteth out in a most solemne assembly, together with the blasphemies of *Nestorius*, most slanderous revilings not onely against *Cyrril*, at whose death hee insulteth, but against all Catholikes, whom he, according to the Nestorian language; calls *Theopaschites* and heretikes: with such false, fained, and lying writings doth the Cardinall fight against the fift Synod and the Acts thereof.

n Vt clarum est  
ex Epist. Theod.  
ad Dioscorum,  
ad Leonem, ad  
Natum, de qui-  
bus diximus su-  
pra, ca. 33.

9. Yea, but still the Cardinall will reply, the Inscription unto *Iohn*, who before was dead, shewes the Epistle to *Iohn* to bee forged, and to be none of *Theodoret's*: It doth not; for the inscription or title of an Epistle or other writing, may bee erronious, and the Epistle truly his whose name it beares, which the Cardinall may see, if need were, in a hundred examples:

10. In the Epistle of Pope *Clement* unto *Iames*, whereof before wee spake, the Cardinall<sup>a</sup> and *Binius*<sup>p</sup> both confesse the inscription to be false, and yet they both hold the Epistle to bee Pope *Clement's*, yea, they can excuse that, and say it was but an error in writing *Iames*<sup>q</sup> in stead of *Simeon* in the title, were they not too too partiall and malicious against this holy Synod, they would as easily have used the same excuse for *Theodoret's* Epistle, and have said, the Epistle is truly his, but in the inscription in the Acts, the name of *Iohn* is, by the writers mis-  
taking, set in stead of *Domnus*.

o An. 69. nu. 43.  
p Notis in 1. E-  
pistolam Clemen-  
tis.  
q In titulum E-  
pistolae, mendo-  
sus [Iacobum]  
irrepsit. Bin.  
loc. cit.



r Lib. 5. ca. 10.  
et secundum  
Chryst. ca. 11.

¶ Vides Lettē,  
ne fingi quidem  
posse ut Pauli-  
nus, quem iactat  
Theodoretus, fu-  
erit Episcopus  
Thessalonicensis.  
Bar. an. 378. nu.  
43.  
r Bin. not. in  
Conc. Rom. 3.  
sub Damaso  
post professionem  
fidei Apollina-  
rii, &c. pa. 908.  
u Scripta fuit  
Synodalis Epi-  
stola à Damaso  
ex Concilio Ro-  
mano ad Pauli-  
num Antioche-  
num. Bar. an.  
378. nu. 41.  
vide n. Binus  
loco citat.  
x Loqis citatis.

11. *Theodoret* in his history sets down an Epistle of Pope *Damasus*, against *Eunomius* and other heretikes; the title in him is thus, The confession of faith which Pope *Damasus* sent to *Paulinus* Bishop of *Thessalonica*; and with this inscription it is also published in the *Venice* edition of the Councils by *Nicholinus*. Did *Damasus* write or send this to *Paulinus* Bishop of *Thessalonica*? No, he did not; there was no *Paulinus* then, nor long after that Bishop of *Thessalonica*, as *Baronius* and *Binus* at large prove and professe. What then? may we here conclude by the Cardinals demonstration; certainly this Epistle was none of Pope *Damasus* writings, it is a forgery and a counterfeit, seeing it is written to *Paulinus*, whereas there was no such man at all? No, the demonstration holds not in Pope *Damasus*, nor in his writings; for notwithstanding this error in the title, *Baronius* and *Binus* hold it both to be the true, undoubted, and Synodall Epistle of Pope *Damasus*, and truly sent from him, but sent to *Paulinus* Bishop of *Antioch*, not to any *Paulinus* Bishop of *Thessalonica*. Applie now this to the Epistle of *Theodoret*, may not it likewise be true, and truly written by *Theodoret*, though the title be either false or impossible? If any demand how that error in *Theodoret*, touching the title of the Epistle, might happen, *Baronius* and *Binus* impute it to the malice and wilful fraud of *Theodoret*; but I much rather ascribe it to the writer, who finding in *Theodoret* the name of *Paulinus*, without any addition, either ignorantly or wickedly, inserted the false addition of *Thessalonica*. Would the Cardinall have dealt favourably with the other inscription of *Iohn*, and in stead of it have put *Dominus*, who was then Bishop of *Antioch*, he might have spared his labour in this point.

12. In the sixteenth Novell of *Iustinian* the inscription is to *Anthimus* Bishop of *Constantinople*, now the date of that Edict is on the thirteenth day of *August* in the year after the Consulship of *Bellisarius*, at which time it is certaine that not *Anthimus*, but *Mennas* was Bishop, for *Mennas* sate in the generall Councell held that year at *Constantinople*, which began on the second of *May*; yea, the Emperour himselfe on the sixt of *August* in the same year and Consulship, dates another Edict unto *Mennas*. So that undoubtedly there is an error in the inscription, and yet notwithstanding this error, the Edict it selfe is without all doubt *Iustinians*, nor will the Cardinals demonstration hold in this.

13. The Epistle of *Felix* the fourth to *Sabina*, was written and dated on the twelfth of the Kalends of *November*, at which time *Felix* was dead. What, may it be by the Cardinals demonstration be rejected for a counterfeit? No, the Cardinall will tell you, it was indeed the Popes Epistle but of *Boniface* the successor of *Felix*, and not as the inscription tels, of Pope *Felix*, & facile accidisse potuit, it might easily happen, that the name of *Felix* might be put in stead of *Boniface* his next successor. Might not the very same and as easily happen in this Epistle of *Theodoret*, that the name of *Iohn* might be put in the inscription in stead of *Dominus* his next successor?

14. There is an Epistle of Pope *Silverius*, wherein he writ an excommunication against *Vigilius* usurping his See, it is dated in some

Copies

y Extat tom. 2.  
Conc. pa. 390.  
z Hac Chronolo-  
gia mendosa est,  
nam hoc mense  
Bonifacius jam  
Pontifex creatus  
erat, ut patet su-  
pra. Bin. not. in  
eam Epist. et  
Bar. an. 530.  
nu. 1.  
b Facile accidisse  
potuit, ut loco  
Bonifacii, Felix  
nomen fuerit ap-  
positum. Bar.  
loco citat.  
c Epist. 1. Sylu.  
extat. tom. 2.  
Conc. pa. 476.

Copies in the yeare of *Basilius* in others of *Bellisarius*, being Consuls. Now in all the time *Silverius* was Pope, neither was *Basilius* nor *Bellisarius* Consuls. What then? shall the Popes Epistle be rejected as a forgery, a counterfeit? No, by no meanes. The Cardinall<sup>e</sup> often mentioneth it, honours it for a rare monument; and to helpe that error, he tels us the date is added more than should be. Might not the like happen to the inscription of *Theodorets* letter in the Synodall acts? Might it not happen that the inscription was onely to the Archbishop of *Antioch*, & that the name of *Iohn* was added more than should be? *Epiphanius* in his Book of heresies sayth<sup>f</sup> that *Iustine Martyr* dyed when *Adrian* was Emperour; a manifest untruth, for *Iustine Martyr* writ an Apology for the Christian faith unto *Antoninus* the successor of *Adrian*, and he was put to death under *Mar. Aurelius*, and *Verus*, 24. yeares<sup>h</sup> after the death of *Adrian*. Will the Cardinall have his demonstration to hold here in *Epiphanius*? so that his booke against heresies must be condemned for a counterfeit, and none of *Epiphanius* writing? No, error irrepsit, there slipt an error into *Epiphanius*; for *Adrian* is written in stead of *Aurelius*, as the Cardinall<sup>i</sup> tels you: but it rather seemes in stead of *Aurelius*, (under whom *Iustine* dyed.) Had the Cardinall beene any way as indifferent to *Theodorets* letters, hee would likewise have said, error irrepsit, an error is slipt into the inscription, by writing *Iohn* in stead of his successor *Domnus*, rather than have condemned the writing for a forgery.

14. In the twenty third Cause, *Question 4. Cap. 30.* in the ancient title it was cited as a text of *Sylvester*, a manifest error of *Sylvester* instead of *Sylverius*. Did the Gregorian Correctors, for this false title or name of *Sylvester* inserted, condemne that Canon or Epistle as a counterfeit? no; but approving the text as true they amended the title, and restored it to *Sylverius*. In the very same Chapter it is said, that *Guillisarius* caused *Sylverius* to bee deposed, there was no *Guillisarius* that ever did that, but it was *Bellisarius*; yet for that error of the name, which yet remaines \* uncorrected; is not the Canon or Epistle rejected.

15. In that fragment of this Synod which *Binius*<sup>i</sup> out of *Tyrius* commendeth, it is sayd that the fift Synod which decreed the Patriarchall dignity to the Bishop of *Ierusalem*, was held in the time of *Vigilius* of *Rome*, *Eutychius* of *Constantinople*, and *Paule* of *Antioch*. Now that by the Cardinals demonstration was never; for it is certaine that there was no *Paul* Bishop of *Antioch* in Pope *Vigilius* his dayes. Before this Synod, was *Ephreem*<sup>k</sup>, who sate eightene yeares, in whose fourteenth, or fiftenth yeare began *Vigilius*<sup>l</sup> to be Pope, to him succeeded *Domnus*<sup>m</sup>, hee sate 18. yeares, in whose<sup>n</sup> seventh or eighth yeare this fift Councell was held, and himselfe personally subscribed unto<sup>o</sup> it, and about his tenth yeare dyed *Vigilius*<sup>p</sup>. So this decree, by the Cardinals owne reason, is but a forgery (as in very truth it is.) Now if he to save the credit of that worthlesse fragment, will admit an error of the writing, *Paulus* being put for *Domnus*, why should he be so hard hearted against the other writing of *Theodorets*, as not to thinke alike error of the pen in it, and *Iohannes* to be put for *Domnus*?

16. That

d Temporibus  
Sylvestri nullus  
convenit Belli-  
sarius consularis  
neg. Basilii.  
Bar. an. 535. 3.  
e idem ait Bini-  
us. margin.  
ad eam epistolam  
c. An. 539. nu. 1.  
f 4.  
g Epiph. bar. 46.  
h Just. Mart. ad  
Antoninum pium  
defensio.  
i Nam Hadrian-  
us obiit an.  
140. Bar. illo an.  
nu. 1. Iustinus  
vero an. 165.  
Bar. illo an. nu. 1.  
j Ecce citat. &  
Notis in Mar-  
tyr. Rom. Apr. 13

\* Guillisarius,  
quia est initium  
capituli non est  
mutatum. Not.  
Greg. in illud  
cap.  
i Post 5. Concil.  
pa. 606. a.  
k Ephreem fede-  
re capit. an. 526.  
Bar. eo an. nu. 59  
sedet ante<sup>n</sup> an.  
18. Niceph. in  
Chron.  
l Vigilius capit.  
an. 440. Bar. eo  
an. nu. 9. is est  
Ephraim an. 19.  
m Niceph. in  
Chron. & Bar.  
an. 446. nu. 68.  
n Nam 8. Dom-  
ni est an. 553.  
quo habitum est  
concilium hoc 5.  
o Collat. 8. pa.  
588. a.  
p Domnus capit.  
an. 446. quare  
ejus an. 10. erit  
555. quo anno  
obijit Vigilius,  
ait Bar. an. 555.  
nu. 1.

ε In appendic  
Cod. Iustin.  
f Bar. an. 451.  
nu. 129.  
ε An 530. nu. 4.

δ Iohannes 2.  
obijt an. 9. Iusti-  
niani. Bar. an.  
535. nu. 26. et  
Editum editum  
an. 10. Iustiniani  
Bar. an. 546.  
nu. 8.

ζ Iohanni Papa  
tempore editum,  
mendaci inscrip-  
tione notatur  
Bar. an. 546. nu.  
10. liquido con-  
stat, non ante  
præfens tempus  
(an. vid. 10. Iu-  
stin.) potuisse ef-  
se conscriptum  
libellum illum.  
Bar. ibid. et  
constat Editum  
Vigili tempore  
conscripum, an.  
534. nu. 21.

η Imperator pro-  
mulgavit Edi-  
ctum. Bar. an.  
546. nu. 8. Ha-  
ellenus Iustiniani  
Editum. ibid.  
nu. 37. et sepi-  
sime similia.  
ζ Sciam perperam  
additum, ipsum  
missum ad Ioh-  
annem. Bar. an.  
534. nu. 21. et  
an. 546. nu. 10.  
α At quam fidem  
rogo merentur  
Acta huiusmodi  
qua sunt hic  
contexta com-  
mentis? Bar.  
an. 553. nu. 46.

θ Act. 1. pa. 3. a.

16. That *Edict* of *Iustinian* which wee have so often mentioned in the ancient editions of Councils before *Binius* had this title; The *Edict* of *Iustinian* sent unto Pope *Iohn* the second. *Coninus* the learned Lawyer, defends that inscription. *Baronius* himselfe somewhat forget. full of what elsewhere hee writeth, calls this 'Edict, *Constitutio data ad Iohannem* a Constitution sent to Pope *Iohn*, & againe; *Iustinian* expressly witnesseth this in his *Edict* to P. *Iohn*; a false title & inscription without al doubt, *Iohn* being dead ten years before this *Edict* was either published, or writ, as *Baronius* himselfe both declares and proves, professing that Inscription to be false. Had the Cardinall remembered his demonstration drawne from the title and Inscription, oh how happily, how easily had he avoided all his trouble of defending *Vigilius* for writing against, and contradicting that *Edict*: Hee might have said, Why, that *Edict* was none of *Iustinians*, nor ever published by him; for the Inscription is to Pope *Iohn* who was dead long before. And because the fifth Council was assembled for discussing that truth which the Emperor in his *Edict* had delivered, and *Vigilius* with the other Nestorians did oppugne, the Cardinal againe might have denyed that ever there had beene any such fifth Council, or any Synodall Acts at all of it; for if there was no *Edict* there could bee no Council, which was assembled and gathered for that onely cause, to define the truth delivered by the *Edict*. This had beene a short cut indeed, and the Cardinall, like another *Alexander*, by this one stroke had dispatched all the doubts and difficultes which neither hee nor all his friends can ever untwine or loose in this Gordian knot. But the Cardinals demonstrations were not in force as then, nor ever, I thinke, till the acts of this fifth Synod, and in them the Epistle of *Theodoret* came to his tryal: for notwithstanding the falshood of that inscription & title, the Card. very honestly acknowledgeth that to bee no counterfeit, but a true imperiall *Edict*, truly published by *Iustinian*, contradicted by *Vigilius*, confirmed as touching the doctrine of the *Three Chapters*, by the fifth Council. Here he can say; that addition to *Iohn* is added, & put amisse in the title by some later hand, by some who knew not accurately to distinguish the times: may not the same as truly excuse this writing of *Theodoret*? the name of *Iohn* is added in the title by some who knew not accurately to distinguish the times, but yet the Epistle it selfe it is truly *Theodorets*. It had beene honest and faire dealing in the Cardinal, any one of these waies to have excused this error in the title of *Theodorets* Epistle, rather than by reason of such an error, as happeneth in many Epistles and writings, to declame, not onely against the Epistle as a base forgery, and none of *Theodorets*, but even against all the Acts of this holy generall Council, as unworthy of credit, because among them an Epistle with an erroneous Inscription is found extant.

17. None, I thinke, doe nor ever will defend the Acts of this or any other Council, or any humane writings to be so absolutely intire, and without all corruption, as that no fault of the writer or exscriber hath crept into them; such faults are frequent in the Acts almost of all Councils. To omit the rest; in those of *Chalcedon*, the Ephesine Latrocinie is said to have beene held when *Zeno* and *Posthumianus* were Consuls,



Consuls, in the third Indiction. An undoubted error; For that Ephesine Conventicle was held when *Protophages* and *Asterius* were Consuls, not when *Zeno* and *Posthumianus*; neither were *Zeno* and *Posthumianus* Consuls in the third, but in the first <sup>d</sup> Indiction: neither was the Councell held either in the first or in the third, but in the <sup>e</sup> second Indiction; and therefore both *Baronius* <sup>f</sup>, and *Binius* <sup>g</sup> say, these words [*tempore Zenonis & Posthumiani venerabilium Consulium indictione tertia*] are false, and by surreption crept into the Acts. Againe, the sixteenth Action or Session is sayd to have beene on the twenty eight <sup>h</sup> of October. A manifest error; seeing their thirteenth Action <sup>i</sup> or Session was on the nine and twentieth, and their fourteenth <sup>k</sup> Session on the thirtieth of October. Yea there are in those Acts farre greater faults than these. For in the third Action <sup>l</sup> is set downe the Imperiall Edict of *Valentinian* and *Marian*, for condemning of *Eutyches*: and yet that Edict was not published untill the 26. of January, when <sup>m</sup> *Sporarius* was Consul: whereas the Councell of *Chalcedon* and all the Acts thereof was ended on the first day of November <sup>n</sup> the yeare before: that is, more than two moneths before that Edict was made. In the seventh Session also there is inserted by *Binius* <sup>o</sup> and *Baronius* <sup>p</sup> an whole Action concerning *Domnus*, who was deposed in the Ephesine Latrocinie, where the Councel decreed that *Maximus* should allow *Domnus* some charges to serve him *pro victu & vestitu*. A forged Action, and that in the highest degree, as not onely the time when it was held; to wit, on the twenty seventh <sup>q</sup> of October; whereas the Session <sup>r</sup> which followed it was held on the five and twentieth, or six and twentieth day of the same moneth, doth declare; but because this *Domnus* was dead before the Councell of *Chalcedon*, as both the Imperiall Edict of *Iustinian* <sup>s</sup>, and the fift Councell; doe certainly witness. Could the Cardinall have found such additions or forgeries inserted into the Acts of this fift Councell, *quos ludos daret*, how would hee have triumphed in the disgrace of these Acts, to have writings in them, and as parts of them and their Synodall Acts, which were not made long after the end of the Councell; to have an whole Action or consultation, what allowance should be made to a dead man for provision of his food and rayment? Here had beene a field indeed for the Cardinall to have insulted over these Acts. And yet, notwithstanding these errors in the two first, and undoubted additions of the Emperours Edict in the third, and that whole ridiculous action, nay fiction, in the fourth, patched unto the Acts of *Chalcedon*; the Cardinall will not so disgrace those Acts; as to use his demonstration against the credit of them, or that Councell: And yet see his unequall and dishonest dealing in these matters, because but one name is inserted into the inscription, or by an error put in stead of another: the Cardinals choler breakes out in this manner against the Acts of this fift Synod, *Quam fidem* <sup>t</sup>, *rogo*, I pray you what credit is to be given to such Acts?

c Marcell. in  
chron. & binc  
certo liquet, quia  
Concilium  
Ephesium se-  
quantum est illud  
Constantinopoli  
habitu in quo  
condemnatu est  
Eutyches a Fla-  
viano, at hoc  
Constantinopoli  
habitu est, Pro-  
tophages et As-  
terius. Coss. ut patet  
in Concil. Chal-  
ced. i. pa. 30.  
d Ut liquet ex  
Marcell. in  
chron.  
e Ps liquet ex  
eodem Marc.  
f Baan. 448. n. 58  
g Hec verba  
[tempore Zenonis  
et Posthumiani  
Ind. 3. one 3.]  
mendosa sunt &  
surreptitia. Bin.  
Not. in Concil.  
ab. Ep. 10. 1.  
h Conc. pa. 1917. b  
i Quinto Ka-  
lendas Novem-  
bris. A. 16.  
k Conc. Chal-  
ced. i. 3. Kalend. No-  
vemb. Conc. Chal-  
ced. A. 17.  
l Prædie Kalend  
Nov. Conc. Chal-  
ced. A. 14.  
m Pa. 84. b.  
n Datum 7. Ka-  
lend. Febr. Spo-  
vario Coss. in  
fine Edicti.  
o Nam ultima  
Sessio habita est  
Kalendas No-  
vemb. dicitur  
enim ibi, postera  
die, postquam po-  
testas vestra sur-  
rexisset, &c. quare  
ultima Sessio  
fuit proxima die  
post Sessionem illa  
qua Actio 14  
& 15 continen-  
tur, at Actio 14  
habita est prædie  
Kalend. Novemb.

o A. 7. pa. 105 b. p Bar. an. 551. nu. 118. q Actio de Domno habita est 6. Kalend. Nov. Bar. an. 451. nu. 139 c.  
Bin. Not. ad Conc. Chalced. pa. 18. r Nam actio sequens que etiam actio Sessio est, in qua Theodorati causa tractatur, habita est  
sub octavo Kalend. Nov. s Chalcedonensis Synodus Domnum post mortem condemnavit. Edict. Iust. 16. 1. Concil. pa. 1917. b.  
t Idem repetit Conc. 5. Cal. 6. pa. 575 b. u An. 553. nu. 46.

in Otho Idus  
Maius. Coll. 5.  
p. 537. b.  
in Collatio 4. di  
4. Idus Maius.  
o Pa. 548. a.

p Pa. 558. b.

q Cap. 140. Con-  
ord. Euang.

r Bez in cap. 27  
Matth. v. 9.

s Videtur hic in-  
clinare Aug. lib.  
3. de conf. Euang.  
ca. 7.

t Sic Orig. sensu  
Homil. 35. in  
Matth.

u Loco citato.

x A Relation of  
the state of Re-  
ligion in the  
West parts. fol.  
14.

y Ibid.

18. Some three or foure errors of the pen, besides this of the inscription, I confesse are also in the Acts of this fift Synod. The fift Collation is sayd to have beene on the eight<sup>m</sup>. (it should be on the thirteenth or fourteenth) of May, seeing the fourth Collation was held on the twelfth<sup>a</sup> of that moneth. In the same fift Collation<sup>c</sup> Cyrill is alledged to say, *Non jam quidem sancta Synodus*, the holy Synod did not now pronounce a sentence against *Nestorius*: the negation (*non*) is by negligence either of *Binius*, or the Printer, crept in, and is certainly to be blotted out, which otherwise not onely makes Saint Cyrill to speake untruly, but even to contradict himselfe. In the same Acti- on P, there is recited an Epistle to *Andreas* Bishop of Samosat, in the inscription whereof *Theodorus* is written in stead of *Theodoretus*, seeing of the next Epistle being *Theodoretus*, it is sayd, *eiusdem ad Nestorium*. It may be some few more such errors may be found in these Acts of the fift Councell; but for the honour of them, I professe, they are so in- corrupt and intire, that more than these I doe not remember my selfe to have for a certainty observed in them. Neither doe such errors creep only into humane writings, their owne learned *Iansenius*<sup>q</sup> (after *Beza*<sup>r</sup>) will tell them, that the very sacred Scriptures are subject to the same: for whereas *Matth. 27. 9*, the Euangelist sayth it is written in the Prophet *Jeremy*; seeing the text there cited is not found in *Ieremie*, but in *Zachary*; although some thinke it to be a slip<sup>s</sup> in memory in Saint *Matthew*; others, that it is in some apochryphall<sup>t</sup> writing of *Jeremy*; others, that *Zachary* had two names (as many other Iewes) and so might be called either *Ieremie* or *Zacharie*; yet *Iansenius* not liking any of these conjectures, rests on this answer as most neare the truth, that either the name of *Zacharie* is *Scriba culpa commutatum in Ieremiam*, by the error and fault of the writer turned into *Jeremy*; or else, that whereas the Euangelist sayd no more, but that this is written in the Prophet (in which sort without any addition or mention of name, some copies to have read that place, Saint *Ansten*<sup>u</sup> is witnesse, and not onely *Rupertus*, but the *Syriack* translator read it in the same man- ner) some more audacious hand expressed the name of *Jeremy*. Do you thinke the Cardinall would or durst use his demonstration in this text? that seeing a wrong name is inserted (not in the title or inscription (as in this Epistle it is) but in the very text,) he would account the Gospell a forgery, and unworthy of credit? It is true, they are too too bold even with the Scriptures also: whereof they gave a no- table prooffe; first when (as it was credibly reported<sup>x</sup> to the relator) some of the Iesuites, even in their solemne Sermons in *Italy*, censured Saint *Paul* for an hot-headed person, who was transported with his pangs of zeale and eagernesse, beyond all compasse in his disputes, and that there was no great reckoning to be made of his assertions; yea that he was dangerous to reade, as favouring of heresie in some places, and better perhaps he had never written: and againe, when (as some Catholikes<sup>y</sup> told it in the hearing of the relator) they held a consul- tation among them, to have censured by some meanes, and reformed the Epistle of Saint *Paul*. Though such be their audaciousnesse, yet I hope the Cardinall will not bee so censorious with the holy Gospell.

What

what hard hap then hath *Theodoret*, that hee alone among all writers, divine and humane, may not have the benefit of his book at the Cardinalls hand; but for one such fault, not onely his writing must be rejected as a forgery, but the Synodall Acts; among which it stands; must be condemned as worthy of no credit?

19. If none of these can mollifie the Cardinals heart; let it yet further be considered, that in his owne Annals<sup>a</sup> it is sayd of the consent of *Vigilius* to the Edict, the fift Synod doth often give witness, *quintam sextam Synodus Actione septima continet monumenta*, Further also the fift Synod in the seventh Action contains the writings of Pope *Vigilius* against the three Chapters. A saying so voyd of truth, that those monuments of *Vigilius*, yea almost any one of them, is able to eat up all that whole seventh Action, it is such a pittance to those large writings of *Vigilius*. Besides; in that seventh action of the fift Councell, there is neither monuments of *Vigilius*, nor so much as any mention of *Vigilius* at all, nor of the three Chapters. Let him againe consider how hee faith<sup>b</sup>, that *Celestine* called the Ephesine Councell by the Emperour *Theodorus*; that is to say, never, if the Cardinall be not relieved with an error or scape of the writer. That elsewhere in the same Annals he<sup>c</sup> sayth, that by the Catholike Church the Romane Church is signified, as appeares *ex Epistola Hormisdæ Papæ ad Iustinum Imperatorem*, by the Epistle (he quoteth the 22.) of Pope *Hormisdæ* to *Iustinus*. An evident error. For neither is that 22. Epistle written to *Iustinus*, but to *Dorotheus* a Bishop; neither is that which the Cardinall alledgeth; either in that 22. or in any other of all the epistles (they are five) which *Hormisdæ* writ to *Iustinus*. But the Card. by a pretty mistaking, first turnes *Iustinian* into *Iustinus*, and then pretends that to be written Epistle 22. and by *Hormisdæ*, and to *Iustinus*; which is written by *Iustinian*, and to *Hormisdæ*, and which followeth the 56. Epistle. Further yet let him remember, how in the same Annals<sup>c</sup> it is said, that before the Edict of *Iustinian* was written, those controversies hapned betwixt *Theodorus* (Bishop of *Cæsarea*) and *Pascalis* the Deacon. The Card. might as wel have said, that the Edict was never written nor published; for there was never any contention nor controversie betwixt *Pascalis* the Deacon, and *Theodorus*; and I doubt; or rather am out of doubt, that there was never any such contention as the Cardinal dreameth of (the best author for it being *Liberatus*, one heretically affected in this cause, and maliciously bent against *Theodorus*) but if there was any such controversie, it was not betwixt *Theodorus* and *Pascalis*, but betwixt *Theodorus* and *Pelagius*. *Pelagius* & not *Pascalis* was the Popes Agent at Constantinople at that time, as not onely *Liberatus*<sup>d</sup>, but *Procopius*<sup>e</sup>, a man of better note testifieth. Now these foule errors (whereupon is consequent that almost all which the Cardinall hath historified for some 10. or 11. yeares is utterly untrue) being extant and recorded in his Annals, though there be violent presumption, to thinke that the Cardinall judged some of them to be indeed no errors, neither of his own memory, nor of the writers pen, seeing when he reviewed or retracted his Tomes, and corrected therein small slips, and very moëtes to such beames as these, as the mistaking of a few months or dayes, or miswriting

<sup>a</sup> an. 547. nu. 40

<sup>b</sup> Bar. an. 536. nu. 32.

<sup>c</sup> Bar. an. 534.

<sup>c</sup> Bar. an. 546. nu. 10.

<sup>d</sup> *Pelagius amicus exilens*  
*Theodorus, volens cinocere. Liber. Brev. ca. 23. 24.*  
<sup>e</sup> *Pelagius Agapetis, Sitorij & Vigily. Bar. an. 536. nu. 116.*  
<sup>e</sup> *Lib. 3. de Bell. Goth. pa. 365.*  
*Pelagius dux Constantinopolis commoratus.*



ting a word or syllable, and the like; yet hee not once mentioneth any correction in these places, yet am I content to allow these to be but slips of the writer or Printer, as writing *Theodorus* in stead of *Theodosius*, *Pascalus* for *Pelagius*, *Dom Hormisdas*, for, to *Hormisdas*; to *Iustine*, for, from *Iustinian*; and *sexta* for *quinta*, or *eadem quinta*; upon condition that the Cardinall and his friends will in like sort consent, that by an error of some writer of these Synodall acts, the name of *Iohn* is either inserted when there was no name, or written in stead of *Domnus* in that inscription. But if they be obstinate and refuse such a reasonable profer, the Card. and all his friends must be patient to heare, how justly and forcibly his owne demonstration may in his owne words be retorted upon himselfe, & these errors of his. Certainly these are patent and manifest lyes and frauds, devised by some hereticall knave or varlet, they are such as every man may perceive to be written by him who was not in any measure a lover of Christian piety: *Sed impudentissimi cuiuspiam Nestorij figmentum*, but they are the fiction of a most impudent Nestorian forgerer. *Et quam fidem rogo, merentur?* and what credit in the world can be given to those writings or Annals, which have such untruths and fictions inserted in them, and are *contexta*, composed and woven together with such untruths? This being abundantly sufficient to satisfie any indifferent man in this matter, yet would I a little further let the Reader see, how childishly and corruptly *Baronius* dealeth in this cause. It is true, I confesse, that *Iohn* dyed before *Cyryll*: for this is cleare and certaine, by many undoubted testimonies in the Councell of *Chalcedon*, not one of all which the Cardinall had the grace to alledge. But all the Cardinals reasons are so weake and withall so full of fraud and untruth, that it is worthy your considering to see his blindness and perverseness even in proving that which is true.

f. 14. vbi  
extat germana  
Cyrilli Episcopi  
Alexandrinii E-  
pistola ad Dom-  
num Antioche-  
num. p. 132. Et  
scopus sit mentio  
Cyrilli mortui  
eodem Domnum ille  
sedebat Antio-  
chia.  
g. Bar. an. 444.  
no. 16.

h. To. 6. an. 440.  
nu. 9.

20. His first reason is this; *I have shewed & this apertissime, that Iohn dyed seven yeares before Cyryll by the Epistle which Theodoret writ to Domnus foure yeares since*, (that is, foure before the yeare 444.) *in the behalfe of one Felicianus, whose estate Theodoret recommends to Domnus.* Truly the Cardinall hath shewed himselfe an egregious trifier hereby: For neither in the 440. nor in any foure yeares either before or after that, doth hee set downe any Epistle of *Theodoret* to *Domnus*, in the behalfe of *Felicianus*. The Epistle which the Cardinall dreameth of, is in behalfe of *Celestianus*, and that is indeed expressed An. 440<sup>b</sup>. where note I pray you, that the Cardinall by a slip either of his owne penne or memory, (as I verily suppose) or of his Scribe, names *Felicianus* in stead of *Celestianus*: God even by this, demonstrating how unjustly he carpes at the Synodall Acts, for that very error or slippe of a penne, which the Cardinall himselfe falls into, even while hee, for the like slippe, declameth against those holy Synodall Acts. And yet there is a worse fault in this reason. For it is no more shewed that *Iohn* dyed before *Cyryll* by that Epistle, than by *Tullies ad Atticum*. That Epistle having neither date, nor any circumstance to induce that, may as well be written Anno 448. as An. 440.

21. His second reason is this: *There are letters*, saith hee<sup>i</sup>, extant of *Theodoret to Domnus the yeare following*, (to wit, an. 437.) and that *Epistle of Theodoret I will set downe in his due place, anno sequenti, the next yeare*. Now in that next yeare, viz. an. 437. there is no Epistle of *Theodoret* set downe by the Cardinall, nor is either *Domnus* or *Theodores* so much as named in all his discourse of that yeare. Is not this now shewed *apertissime*? you may bee sure the Cardinall would not have feared to performe his promise, but that there was somewhat in that Epist.<sup>wch</sup> would have bewrayed his lewd dealing in this cause.

22. His third reason is drawne from the testimony of *Nicephorus* Bishop of *Constantinople*. This, saith hee<sup>k</sup>, *exploratum habetur, is sure and certaine by Nicephorus*. No, it is sure and certaine by *Nicephorus* that *Baronius* is erroneous in this matter; for *Nicephorus*<sup>l</sup> accounteth *John* to have beene Bishop of *Antioch* eightene yeares, and the Cardinall<sup>m</sup> will allow him no more but thirteene, now the first yeare of *John* cannot possibly be before the yeare 427. for in that year *Theodotus*, the next predecessor of *John*, dyed, as *Baronius*<sup>n</sup> himselfe proveth. Add now unto these seventene moe, and then the death of *John* by *Nicephorus* will bee an. 444. which is the selfe same yeare wherein *Cyrill* dyed. Is not this a worthy prooffe to shew *John* to have dyed seven yeares before *Cyrill*, as the Cardinall avoucheth that he did? Or do not you thinke the Cardinall was in some extasy, to produce *Nicephorus* as a witnesse for him; whereas *Nicephorus* (as the Cardinall himselfe also confesseth) gives to *John* 18. yeares, and the Cardinall allowes him but thirteene; and whereas the Cardinall of set purpose refuteth the account of *Nicephorus*?

23. But will you bee pleased to see how the Cardinall refuteth him? *Domnus*, saith hee<sup>o</sup>, was Bishop of *Antioch* an. 437. as is proved by an Epistle of *Theodoret* written to *Domnus* in that yeare, which Epistle I will set downe in his due place, to wit; an. 437. Lo, all his prooffe is from that Epistle, which the Cardinall, contrary to his own promise, doth not, and, as I thinke, durst not set downe.

24. But see further how the Cardinall is infatuated in this cause: *John*, saith he<sup>p</sup>, dyed an. 436. having beene Bishop 13. yeares. *John* succeeded to *Theodotus*, who dyed an. 427. Say now in truth, is not the Cardinall a worthy Arithmetitian, that of 427. and 13. can make no more than 436? And is not this a worthy reason to refute *Nicephorus*? But this is not all, for *Baronius*<sup>r</sup> glossing upon *Theodoret*'s letter to *Dioscorus*, which, as hee<sup>f</sup> saith, was written, an. 444. there observes with a *memorandum*, that by this passage of *Theodoret* you may see how long *Theodotus*, *John*, and *Domnus* had sitten in the See of *Antioch*, to wit, 26. yeares in all, from the time that *Theodoret* was made Bishop unto that 444. yeare, viz. *Theodotus* 6. *John* 13. and *Domnus* 7. untill that yeare *Theodoret*, as *Baronius*<sup>u</sup> will assure you, was made Bishop, an. 423. Add now unto these six of *Theodotus*, thirteene of *John*, and 7. of *Domnus*, and tell me whither you thinke the Cardinall had sent his wits, when hee could summe these to bee just 444?

25. Or will you see the very quintessence of the Cardinals wisdom? *I will*, saith he<sup>x</sup>, set downe the next yeare (that is, an. 437.) the

k Bar. an. 553. nu. 44.

l Iohannes in Nicoph. in Chro.

m Iohannes obiit cum sedisset annos 13. licet Nicophorus in Chronico tribuat ei 18. Bar. an. 436. nu. 12.

n Post hac Theodotus ex hac vita migravit, qui ad hunc usque annum pervenisse proditur, &c. Bar. an. 427. nu. 25.

o Bar. an. 436. nu. 12.

p Bar. Ibid. q Bar. an. 427. nu. 26. Desancto Theodoto, subrogatus est in ejus locum Iohannes.

r Bar. an. 444. nu. 23.

s Theodoretus ad Dioscorum data hac anno Epistola sic se habet.

An. illo nu. 18. t Hinc discas annos cuiusque ipsorum Episcopatus. Bar. an. 444. nu. 23.

u Bar. an. 423. nu. 10. Hoc anno Theodoretus creatus est Episcopus.

pus.

x Bar. an. 437. nu. 12.

very Epistle of Theodoret to Domnus, which was then written unto him; & eam quâ monstratur, & I wil also set downe in his due place (to wit, an. 444.) that Epistle of Theodoret to Dioscorus, whereby is shewed, that Iohn was Bishop of Antioch just thirteene years. Thus Baronius; who by these two Epistles of Theodoret will prove both these. As much in effect as if hee had said, I have already <sup>y</sup> proved, that Iohn began to bee Bishop of Antioch an. 427. and this being set downe for a certainty: I will now prove by Theodoret's Epistle to Domnus, that Iohn dyed an. 436. that is, in his ninth yeare; and then I will prove againe by Theodoret's Epistle to Dioscorus, that hee dyed in his thirteenth yeare, and so dyed not till the yeare 440. Or, as if hee had thus said, I will first prove, that mine owne Annals are untrue, wherein it is said <sup>z</sup>, that Iohn dyed in the yeare 436. which is but the ninth yeare of Iohn; because he dyed not, as Theodoret in one Epistle <sup>a</sup> witnesseth, untill his thirteenth yeare, which is an. 440. And then I will prove unto you, that mine own Annals are againe untrue, wherein it is said <sup>b</sup>, that Iohn was Bishop thirteene yeare, and so dyed not till an. 440. (beginning the first, an. 427) because Theodoret, in another Epistle <sup>c</sup>, witnesseth, that Iohn dyed an. 436. Or thus, I will first prove, that Iohn was dead an. 436. though he was alive an. 440. and then I will prove unto you, that Iohn was alive an. 440. though he was dead an. 436.

y An. 427. nu. 26

z An. 436. nu.

12. Hoc anno Iohannes diem obiit extremum.

a Theodor. Epist.

ad Diosc. apud

Bar. an. 444. nu.

23. Alios 13. id-

pore Iohannis.

b Bar. an. 436.

nu. 12. Iohannes

sedit annos 13.

c Anno sequenti

(vid. an. 437.)

extant litera

Theodoret's ad

ejus successorem

Domnum. Bar.

an. 436. nu. 12.

d Extant litera

Theodoret's ad

Domnum Bar.

an. 436. nu. 12.

e Hactenus The-

odoret's ad Diosc.

Epistola Bar. an.

440. nu. 29.

26. Is not this brave dealing in the Cardinall? is hee not worthy of a cap and a fether too, that can prove all these? and prove them by Theodoret's Epistles? or doe you not think those to be worthy Epistles of Theodoret, by which such absurdities, such impossibilities may bee proved? Nay, doth not this alone, if there were no other evidence, demonstrate those Epistles of Theodoret to bee counterfeits? If that to Domnus be truly his, as Baronius assures <sup>d</sup> you, wherby Iohn is shewed to have dyed an. 436. then certainly the other to Dioscorus must needs bee a forgery, whereby Iohn is shewed to live an. 440. Again, if that to Dioscorus be truly his, as Baronius <sup>e</sup> assures you, wherein Iohn is said to live an. 440. then certainly the other to Domnus must of necessity bee a forgery, wherein Iohn is said to be dead an. 436. And as either of these two Epistles demonstrates the untruth and forgery of the other, so they both demonstrate the great vanity of Baronius, who applauds them both, & who wil make good what they both do affirm; that is, the same man to bee both dead and alive, a Bishop and no Bishop; at the selfe same time, and by these worthy reasons doth the Cardinall refute his owne witnesse Nicephorus, who by giving eighteene yeares to Iohn, shewes plainly that Iohn and Cyrill dyed within one yeare, which account perhaps gave occasion to the exscriber of the Synodall Acts to thrust in the name of Iohn, whom, upon Nicephorus account hee thought to live after Cyrill, whereas in very deed hee dyed some while before Cyrill.

27. His fourth and last reason is drawn from a Canonick Epist. of Cyrills to Domnus, which is set done in the adjections to Theodorus Balsamon, whence it is out of all doubt, saith the Cardinall <sup>f</sup>; that Iohn dyed before Cyrill, seeing Cyrill writ unto his successor Domnus. But howsoever the Cardinall vanteth, that this reason will leave no doubt, yet, if you observe

f Bar. an. 553. nu. 44.



observe it, there are two great doubts therein: The former is, whether that Epistle be truly *Cyrill's*: And besides other reasons, that one point which the Cardinall himselfe mentioneth, may justly cause any to thinke it none of his; for as the Cardinall saith, the Author of that Epistle ascribes such authority to *Domnus*, that he might *ad libitum*, at his pleasure put out Bishops, and at his pleasure restore them. Now there is none that knowes the learning, moderation, and wisdom of *Cyrill*, that can thinke *Cyrill* ever to have written in such manner either to any Metropolitane, or to any Patriarke, specially seeing *Cyrill* was not ignorant of that Canon of the Councell at *Antioch*<sup>h</sup>, let not a Metropolitane doe any thing in such causes, without the advise and consent of the other Bishops in the Province.

28. The other doubt is, whether that *Domnus*, to whom this Epistle is written, bee the same *Domnus* that was Bishop of *Antioch*, and successor to *Iohn*. The Cardinall is much troubled in removing this doubt, and hee windes himselfe divers wayes. Sure it is, saith *Baronius*<sup>i</sup>, that hee who had such authoritie must needs bee some eminent Bishop, and not one of an inferior See. True, but hee might bee a Metropolitane and so have inferiour Bishops under him, and yet bee no Patriarke. Again, saith hee<sup>k</sup>, There is no *Domnus* else but this *Domnus* Bishop of *Antioch*, mentioned either in the Councell of *Ephesus* or *Chalcedon*, who had such authority, as to depose and restore Bishops, *ad libitum*. As if *Domnus* of *Antioch* might doe it *ad libitum*: But in such lawfull manner as *Domnus* of *Antioch* might doe it, there were others called by the name of *Domnus*, and those mentioned in those very Councels, who might upon just cause, and by due and Canonical proceeding depose and restore their inferiour Bishops: looke but into those Councels, and you will admire both the supine negligence of the Cardinall in this point, and his most audacious down-facing of the truth; for, to omit others, both in the Conventicle of *Ephesus*, and the Councell of *Chalcedon*, there is often mention of *Domnus* Bishop of *Apamea*, a Metropolitane Bishop, as the words of *Miletius*<sup>l</sup> doe witnesse, *I Miletius Bishop of Larissa*, speaking for *Domnus* the Metropolitane Bishop of *Apamea*; and for this *Domnus* hee subscribed<sup>m</sup>. And that you may see how fraudulently the Cardinall dealt in this very point, he neither would set downe that Epistle, nor acquaint you with that which in *Balsamon*<sup>n</sup> is expressly noted; that *Peter* the Bish. whom that *Domnus*, unto whom *Cyrill* writeth, had deposed, was *Alexandrinus Sacerdos*, a Bishop of the patriarchall diocese of *Alexandria*, what had *Domnus* of *Antioch* to doe with the *Alexandrian* Bishops. So cleare it is by *Balsamon*, that this *Domnus*, unto whom *Cyrill* writ, was not *Domnus* of *Antioch*, as the Card. I feare against his knowledge, avoucheth,

29. Thus you see all and every reason which the Cardinall bringeth *Iohn* to bee dead seven yeares before *Cyrill*, not only to be weak and unable to enforce that Conclusion, but withall to bee full fraught with frauds and untruths: So that if I had not found more sound and certaine reasons to perswade this, I could never by the Cardinals proofes have beene induced to thinke that an error in the Inscription of *Theodoret's* Epistle. But seeing upon the undoubted testimonies

g. Nullus alius nomine Domnus inscriptus legitur, qui tanta polleret autoritate ut ad libitum (quod dictum est) deponere atque restituere Episcopos posset. Bar. an. 553. nu. 44. h. Conc. Antioch. sub Iulio 1. can. 9.

i. Vnde apparet, non inferiorem sed aliquem esse potuisse ejus nominis Episcopum. an. 553. nu. 44. k. Certè quidem in serie Episcoporum Orientalium, qui Concilio Ephesino, et Chalcedonensi interfuerunt, nullus alius ejus nominis Domnus inscriptus reperitur. &c. Ibid.

l. Act. 3. Conc. Chal. pa. 75. b.

m. Act. eadem pa. 81. et Act. 6. pa. 101. a. n. Sic enim in margine illius Epistolæ notat ut, videtur tempore Cyrilli, emissus esse Romanus, basius Alexandrini Sacerdotis appellatio.

in the Councell of *Chalcedon* it is certaine, that *Iohn* dyed before *Cyrril*, I willingly acknowledge a slip of some writer in that Inscripti-  
on, but yet the Epistle it selfe must bee acknowledged truly to bee  
*Theodorets*, which is all that the Synod avoucheth, and which is that  
which the Cardinall undertooke to disprove, but by no one reason  
doth offer to prove the same. And even for that error also in the  
Inscription I doubt not, but those who can have the sight of the Greek  
and Originall, yea, perhaps of some ancient Latine copies of the Acts  
of this fift Councell, shall finde either no name at all, or, which I ra-  
ther suppose, the name of *Domnus* expressed therein; in stead of which,  
whereas some ignorant audacious exscriber, hath thrust in the name  
of *Iohn*; it is not, nor ought it to bee any impeachment at all to the  
Synodall Acts, unlesse the Cardinall will acknowledge his owne An-  
nals to bee of no credit, because in them *Pascalis* is written by some  
such error, for *Pelagius*, *Iohn* for *Vigilius*, *Iustinus* for *Iustinianus*,  
*Theodorus* for *Theodosius*, *Sexta* for *Quinta*, *Felicianus* for *Celestianus*,  
and a number the like in other causes, most of these slips pertai-  
ning to this very cause of the *Three Chapters*, of which wee doe en-  
treate.

## CAP. XXXV.

That Baronius himselfe followeth many forged writings, and fabulous  
narrations in handling this cause of the fift Councell, as particularly the  
excommunication alcribed to *Mennas*, *Theodorus* and others, and  
the narration of *Anastasius*.

1.



OV have seene all the exceptions which their  
great *Momus* could devise against these  
Acts, to prove them corrupted, either by al-  
teration or mutilation, or, which is the worst  
of all, by additions of forged writings. But  
alas, who can endure to heare *Baronius* de-  
clame against corrupted, false, forged, or  
counterfeit writings? *Quis tulerit Gracchus?*  
better might *Gracchus* invey against sedition, or *Verres* against bribe-  
ry, than *Baronius* against the using of false and fained writings. *Aethio-  
pem albus derideat*, hee should first have washt away those foule blemi-  
shes out of his owne Annals, more blacke herewith than any *Aethio-  
pian*, and then have censured such spots in others. Were his Annals  
well purged of such writings, their vast Tomes would become a pret-  
ty Manuall: They who have occasion to examine other passages in  
*Baronius* will finde the truth hereof in them, for this one concerning  
the fift Councell, Pope *Vigilius*, and the cause of the *Three Chapters*,  
from which I am loath to digresse, I doubt not, but whosoever will  
compare the Cardinals Annals with this Treatise, wil easily perceive,  
that all which hee hath said in defence of the Pope relyeth on no other  
nor better grounds, but either forged writings, or, if truly written  
by

by the authors, yet on some fabulous narration and untruths, which from them the Cardinall hath culd out, as onely fit for his purpose. Suffer me to give a tast hereof in some of them.

2. The first in this kinde is a supplication to *Vigilius*, or a brieve confession made unto him by *Mennas* Bishop of *Constantinople*, *Theodorus* Bishop of *Casarea*, and divers other Easterne Bishops, inserted in the beginning of the Constitution of *Vigilius*, and much applauded by the Cardinall \* in this cause; and this to bee a meere fiction is by many evident proofes, before mentioned, easily discerned. The occasion of it, as the Cardinall tels us <sup>b</sup>, was to humble themselves to Pope *Vigilius*, and acknowledge the injuries they had done in writing and declaming against <sup>c</sup> him, and his Synodall Constitution for Taciturnity concerning the *Three Chapters*. Now seeing that whole matter is fictitious, for neither was there any such Synod ever held, nor any such decree ever made; the confession which is grounded on them, must be like them, fabulous and forged.

a Bar. an. 590.  
nu. 29.

b Ibid. et nu. 20.

c *Vigilio non acquiescit, sed illi plane despectus, et insultatus, &c.* Bar. an. 551 nu. 3.

3. The contents bewray the dulnesse of the forgerer; the Easterne Bishops professe there; to imbrace the foure former Councils, and all the Acts thereof, in all causes, judgements and Constitutions, made with consent <sup>d</sup> of the Popes Legates. Why? the Easterne Bishops knew right well, that some Canons were concluded both in the Councils of *Constantinople* and *Chalcedon*, not only without, but quite contrary to the minde of the Pope and his Legates, as namely, that about the dignity of *Constantinople*, which they, notwithstanding the resistance of the Legates, both approved and knew it to have beene ever held in force by the judgement of the Catholike Church, but specially by the Bishops of *Constantinople*, whose Patriarchall dignity, which they ever after the second Councell enjoyed, was both decreed and confirmed by those Canons. Never did the Easterne Bishops in those dayes, nor long after, esteeme the Popes owne, much lesse his Legates consent, so necessary to any Synodall Decree, but that without them the same might bee made and stand in force as the judgement of the generall Councell and whole Church. And to goe no further, what an unlikely and incredible thing is it, that *Theodorus* and the rest in one yeare should make this confession to accept no more of those Synodall decrees, then the Pope or his Legates were pleased to allow; and the very next yeare after, contrary to that their confession, themselves hold a Synod, and make a Synodall decree in this cause of the *Three Chapters*, not onely without the Popes consent, or presence either of himself or his Legate, but even contrary to his definitive sentence made known unto them? the deviser of that confession shewes himselfe plainly to have beene some of the Vaticane favourites, who living perhaps in the time of *Gregory*, by this intended to infringe the dignity of the See of *Constantinople*, and those Canons which were concluded both in the 2. and 4. Councell, whereas the Easterne Bishops notwithstanding the contradiction and resistance of the Pope held them ever in as great authority and reverence, as any Canons in all the foure former Councils.

d *Universa ab eisdem Synodis Communi consensu cum Vicariis sedis Apostolicae iudicia conservamus, &c. in exemplo confess. quod extat in initio Constitutionis Vigili.*

4. Againe what a silly devise was it to make *Mennas*, *Theodorus*,  
and



*e De injurijs be-  
atitudinis vestra  
falsis, ego quidam  
nullam feci, &c.  
ibid.*

*f Extat inter E-  
pist. Vigilij post  
Epistolam 16.*

*g Tali promissa  
satisfactioe Vi-  
gilius eosdem in  
communio-  
nem accepit.  
Bar. an. 552.  
nu. 20.  
h An. eodem nu.  
19.*

*i Bar. an. 551. nu.  
3. et 552. nu. 19.*

*k Bar. an. 552.  
an. 3 et seq.*

and a great number of Bishops to aske pardon of the Pope for that wherein they professe themselves no way to bee guilty? *I have done no injuries to your Holinesse, yet for the peace of the Church, veluti si eas fecissem veniam postulo, I pray you forgive mee that which I never did, as if I had done it.* Can any man thinke this the submission of wise men, of such stout and constant mindes as *Memnas* and *Theodorus*, besides the rest, had? or what could bee devised more repugnant to that which *Vigilius* is made to say in his excommunication<sup>f</sup> of *Theodorus*, *Thou scandalizing the whole Church, and being warned, entreated; threatened by me, hast refused to amend: & nunquam a pravâ intentione cessasti, and never hast thou ceased from thy wicked designe, nor to write and preach novelties, (so he eals the condemning of the Three Chapters) yea, after the Constitution for silence, to which thou hadst sworn, thou hast openly read in the Pallace a booke against the Three Chapters; thou hast bene the firebrand and the beginner of the whole scandall, thou hast despised the authority of the Apostolike See.* Thus saith the Excommunication. Was *Vigilius* well advised, thinke you, to accept, as a satisfaction and submission for so many and so hainous crimes of insolency, contempt, perjury, sacrilege, and the like, this confession at the hands of *Theodorus*, wherein he doth in effect give the Pope the lie, saying and avouching, *I have written no bookes at all contrarie to that Decree of Silence made by your Holinesse, and for the injuries which have bene done to your holinesse, and to your See, eas quidem non feci, truly I have done none at all.* Is not this a worthy submission? the Pope saith, he hath done innumerable and very hainous injuries to him, such as deserved the censure of excommunication: No, saith *Theodorus*, *I have done none at all unto him: and this the Pope, like a wise man, takes for a good satisfaction, or an humble submission upon which hee is presently reconciled, and shakes hands with that capitall offender. Or where was the Cardinals judgment when he saith<sup>h</sup> of this confession, that in it *Theodorus* did suppliciter, humbly intreat pardon of *Vigilius*, deirrogatis in ipsum probis & contumelijs, for the scoffes and contumelies which hee had used against the Pope. If this confession was true and reall, then certainly the Excommunication of *Vigilius* is not only most unjust, but a very foolish fiction: If the Excommunication was true and reall, then must needs this submission bee fained and fictitious. True they cannot bee both, but that both should be false and counterfaits, is not onely possible, but certaine.*

5. If nothing else, the time when this Confession was made by *Theodorus* and *Memnas* demonstrates this. It was made after the Decree<sup>i</sup> of *Taciturnity*, and the Synod wherein that was concluded, and that was indeed never: that decree and Synod are meerely *Chymericall*, this Confession then made after them, and mentioning that decree, cannot possibly be reall: It was made, as the Cardinal<sup>k</sup> assures us, after that *Vigilius*, fleeing the persecution of *Iustinian*, had fled, first, to Saint *Peters* in *Constantinople*, then to the Church of *Embennia* at *Chalcedon*; yea, after that the Emperour had revoked and abrogated his Edict against the *Three Chapters*, and *Vigilius*, at the earnest intreaty of the Emperour, was now returned from *Chalcedon* to *Constantino-*

*ple;*

ple: and this was at Nevermasse: neither did *Iustinian* persecute *Vigilius*, neither did *Vigilius* for feare of his persecution flee either to *S. Peters*, or to *Chalcedon*; neither did *Iustinian* intreat him to returne from thence, whither hee fled not at all, nor ever did the Emperour adnull or revoke his *Edict* against the three Chapters: then certainly the confession wch by the Cardinalls own profession & acknowledgement followed all these, must needs be like them, a fiction and meere forgery, never really & truly made by *Mennas*, *Theodorus*, and the rest of those Bishops. Lastly, it was made the next yeare before the fift Councell was held, that is, anno 552. which is the twenty sixt of *Iustinian*, as the Cardinall witnesseth; before which time it cannot bee imagined to have beene made; for the excommunication of *Theodorus* was published but in that yeare in which *Vigilius* came to *Chalcedon*, as *Baronius* confesseth. Now it is a riddle which *Oedipus* cannot dissolve, how *Mennas*, who, as wee have certainly proved by the Acts of the sixt Councell, dyed in the 21. yeare of *Iustinian*, should come now in his 26. yeare, that is, foure or five yeares after his death, to offer up a supplication to *Vigilius*, and aske pardon of him for doing no offence against him. Me thinkes either the Pope should be afrighted with such a gastly sight, or *Baronius* ashamed to applaud such fortifick fictions, as is that excommunication of *Mennas* made by *Vigilius*: and the *Encyclycall* Epistle of *Vigilius*, which mentions and approves that excommunication, and this forged confession; none of which will suffer the ghost of *Mennas* to rest, but bring a dead man out of his grave, to heare the Popes sentence thundred out against him, and then come with a bill of supplication to beg forgiveness of his Holinesse, who had more reason to have prayed pardon of *Mennas* for disquieting and waking him out of that long and sound sleepe.

6. So both the occasion, the contents, and the time, besides other circumstances, doe evidently convince that submission to bee a counterfeit. But how comes it then into the Popes Constitution? You must enquire this of *Baronius*, or of those who have accesse to the Vaticane whence this Constitution was taken: might one have the sight of the Vaticane copy, I doubt not but either there are some evident prints of error, in inserting this confession into it; or which I exceedingly mistrust, *Baronius* hath used a litle of the Vaticane art in this matter. Howsoever, certaine it is that this confession hath neither fit coherence, nor any dependence at all of ought in the Constitution, but it is both complete and much more orderly, this being wholly expunged, than if so idle a fiction be annexed unto it. But let the Cardinall and his friends looke to this matter by what meanes or whose fraud this was inserted, I thought needfull to admonish the of the fault, nor for the love and affection I beare to that Constitution of *Vigilius*, could I with silence see and suffer it to be blemished therewith.

7. The second is *Eustathius*, of whom I would have spoken more in this place, but that his fained and fabulous narrations are so clearly discovered before, that I thinke it needlesse to adde ought concerning him, or them.

8. The third writing is a book in very great request with *Baronius*, and

I Anno illo 552.  
nu. 19.

m Hæc de sen-  
sentia in Theo-  
dorum ac Men-  
nam lata *Vigi-*  
lius, que ipse  
scripsit anno se-  
quenti in Basili-  
ca S. Euphemie  
Chalcedone. Bar.  
an. 551. nu. 18.

in Apud Bar. an.

444. nu. 23.

o Cum 26. annis

Ecclesiam rexe-

rim. Theod. apud

Bar. an. 449.

nu. 119.

p Apud Bar.

an. 444. nu. 23.

q In Epist. ad

Leonem. apud

Bar. an. 449. nu.

120. A me enim

scripta sunt alia

quidem ante

annos viginti,

&c.

x Extant tom. 5.

act. Conc. Ephef.

pa. 859. et jeqm.

sub hoc titulo.

Reprehensio 12.

Capitulum

Cyrilli, à Theodo-

reto Episcopo

Cyri.

5 Hominem su-

mm admirari,

et scripsimus ad

Cyrillum beata

memorie, &c.

Theod. apud Bar.

an. 444. nu. 28.

2 Theodoret al-

loquutio, apud

Conc. 5. Coll. 5. p.

559. b.

u Ego multas

habeo myriadas

hominum qui

doctrina verita-

tem et rectitudi-

nem mihi testan-

tur. Theod. apud

Bar. an. 444.

nu. 22.

x Litera que à

Theodoro ad

Irenam tunc

(id est, ut ipse

explicat, hoc an-

no 448.) reddita

sunt. Bar. an.

440. nu. 7. 8.

y Statuimus ut

Irenam à sancta

Tyriorum Ecce-

lesià statim expel-

latur. Edict.

Theod. quod extat lo. 5. Conc. Ephef. ca. 19.

448. nu. 9.

2 Es nunc Domine duo nobis proponimus, vel Deum offendere at conscientiam ledere, vel incidere in injusta ho-

minum decreta, &c. Theod. ibid.

b Epistola eadem.

c Illa Theodoret Epistola scripta ad Nemonum hoc ipso anno Bar. an. 448

nu. 11.

d Alii quidem omnibus aperta est civitas, non solum Argy et Eunomy sectatoribus, sed et Manicheis, et Marcionistis,

&c. Theod. epist. ad Nemonum. apud Bar. an. 448. nu. 12.

e Nullum non virtutis genus sedulo excultis, &c. sic Theodosium ju-

dicare ut aliquam Sororum. i. prefat. ad suam histor.

f Pissimum sollicitudinem Christiane religionis habetis, ut in populo Dei

que sublimata, aut hereses, aut ulla scandala convalescant. Leo. epist. 7. que est ad Theodosium.

g Leg. 66. de her. cod. Theod.

et id quod extat in Conc. Chal. act. 3. pa. 84.

h Definivimus nos ceteris debere omnibus subjacere, &c. Edict. Theod. in

Conc. Chal. loc. cit.

and that is, those Epistles which beare the name of *Theodores*, of which though much hath beene sayd before; yet will I here adde somewhat to manifest them further to bee counterfeited, and most false. Among them, two are most eminent; that to *Dioscorus*, and the other to Pope *Leo*. That the former is forged, the other doth demonstrate. For by that to *Dioscorus* which was writt anno 444. *Theodoret* is made to say, that he had then beene Bishop 26. yeares<sup>a</sup>, whereas by the later writt anno 449. it is cleare that in that yeare he had beene Bishop, no more<sup>b</sup> than 26. yeares: So *vice versa*, that the later is forged is demonstrated by the former; for by that to *Leo* written anno 449. *Theodoret* is made to say that he had then beene Bishop just 26. whereas by the other to *Dioscorus* written anno 444. it is witnessed that hee had beene Bishop 26: <sup>p</sup> yeares, five yeares before he writ to *Leo*. And they are both demonstrated to be mere fictitious, in that *Theodoret* is made in them both to testifie that for that whole time of 26. yeares he had beene orthodoxall in faith; and for prooffe thereof he appeales<sup>c</sup> to his owne writings, written 12. 15. and 20. yeares before that; whereas it is as cleare as the Sunne that hee was a most earnest defender and writer in defence of *Nestorius* and his heresies, and for this cause was justly condemned by the holy Councell of *Ephefus*, yea and his writings yet extant<sup>d</sup> doe undenyably convince the same: Besides in that to *Dioscorus*, hee professeth<sup>e</sup> his ardent affection and love to *Cyrril*, whereas after *Cyrril*'s death, in an open assembly at *Antioch* he most bitterly<sup>f</sup>, unjustly, and spitefully declaimed against him. Further, in that to *Dioscorus*, it is said that he was orthodoxall<sup>g</sup> anno 444. when that Epistle was written; whereas in his Epistle written anno 448. <sup>x</sup> or after, unto *Irene* a Nestorian Bishop of *Tyre*, justly deposed<sup>y</sup> by the Emperour, he bemoanes both the publike cause and the case of *Irene*, comparing his to the cause<sup>z</sup> of *Susanna*, and lamenting that either<sup>a</sup> they must offend God, and hurt their owne conscience, (if they forsake Nestorianisme,) or else fall into unjust decrees and punishments of men, (if they continued in that doctrine;) and who further calls this deposed and hereticall Bishop, *Dilectissimum*<sup>b</sup>, & *piissimum Irenam*, *The most beloved, and most holy Irene*. The like forgery might be shewed in his Epistle to *Nomon*, written also anno 448. <sup>c</sup> wherein hee exclaimeth against the Emperour *Theodosius*, as if he had given toleration<sup>d</sup> & free liberty of Religion to Arians, Eunomians, Manichees, Marcionites, Valentinians, & *Montanists*, & yet restrained yea excluded him *ab omni civitate, from every City in his Emptre*; which to bee a most vile and unjust slander, the piety and zeale of *Theodosius*, highly renowned both by *Sozomen*<sup>e</sup>, and Pope *Leo*<sup>f</sup> doth demonstrate; and whose<sup>g</sup> *Edicts* against heretikes do also manifest the same, seeing therein out of his hatred to heresie, and specially to Nestorianisme, he forbids any<sup>h</sup> such to



Cap. 35. That action concerning *Domnus* inserted at *Chalcedon*, a forgery. 445

enjoy their Sees, or to scape unpunished; and being misinformed that *Flavianus* and *Eusebius* of *Dorileum* were Nestorians, hee upon that misinformation, unjustly and rashly subjected them to that censure; but being truly enformed of *Domnus* and *Theodoret*, that they embraced Nestorianisme, he justly confirmed their deposition, forbidding any either to reade or have the bookes or *Theodoret*<sup>k</sup>, or of *Nestorius*, *Theodoret*s being every whit as bad as the bookes of *Nestorius*. It were easie to shew the like prints of forgery in all those Epistles going under the name of *Theodoret*, which the Cardinall so much magnifieth: but I am loth to stay too long in them, the falshood of which hath beene so often before demonstrated.

9. A fourth is that Action concerning *Domnus*, inserted by *Baronius* and *Binius* into the Acts of the Councell at *Chalcedon*. This to be undoubtedly a forgery and fiction, was before proved, because *Domnus* was dead before the Councell at *Chalcedon*; for so both the Emperour *Iustinian* in his *Edict*, and the fift Councell expressly witness, saying, the holy Councell at *Chalcedon* condemned *Domnus* post mortem, after he was dead, for that he durst write that the twelve chapters of *Cyrril* should not be spoken of. Now that whole Action containing nothing else but a consultation and decree for the maintenance of *Domnus*, by some annuall allowance out of the revenewes of the See of Antioch, none I thinke will once imagine that so grave, so wise and worthy an assembly of 603. Bishops, would either consult or make a decree for the allowance of a stipend or maintenance to be given to a dead man: specially not to *Domnus*, whose deposition in the Ephesine latrocinie the whole Councell of *Chalcedon* approved: and it is very unlikely they would judge him worthy to have maintenance out of that Bishopricke, of which by reason of his heresie they judged him most justly to be deprived. But if there were no other reasons to manifest this, the place whence it comes might justly cause one to distrust the same: for is it thinke you in the Greeke and originall copies of that Councell? No certainly, it is not: as both the Cardinall and *Binius* will assure you; *Desideratur in Graeco, it is wanting in the Greeke or originall*: nor onely is it now wanting there, but certum est eadem caruisse Graeca exemplaria tempore *Iustiniani*; It is certaine the Greeke copies had not this Action in the time of *Iustinian* the Emperour. Is it mentioned in *Liberatus*? or in *Evagrius*? or in *Nicephorus*? all which set downe the summe of the Actions in that Councell? No, it is not in any of them: Whence then comes this worthy action that so carefully provides victuals for a dead man? Truly out of their old Mint-house the Vaticane: *Hac Actio scripta in Latino veteri codice Vaticano*: There is in the Vaticane an old manuscript Latine copie, which is sayd to have beene the copy of *Albinus* and *Proculus*, and in that old written booke, this Action is found, saith *Baronius*. A very Gibeonite you may be sure. It came with old moulded bread, (such as was fittest to feed a dead man) with old mouldy shooes and torne clothes, and so deceived the Cardinall: No, it deceived him not, but by it hee would deceive others, and not onely most shamefully deprave and corrupt the Acts of the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, as hee and *Binius* have

i Excludi ab Episcopatu (volunt) Flavium & Eusebium, Domnum quoque & Theodoretum. ibid.

k Sed nec habeat quis, vel legat, proferatque, Nestorij codices, neque Theodoretis scripta. ibid.

q Conc. Chalced. Act. 7.

r In Ist. Edict. 10.  
2. Conc. pa. 498.  
s Col. 6 p. 575. b.

t Hac actio desideratur in Graeco codice. Baronius. 451. num. 129. & Binius. not in Conc. Chalced. p. 183.

u an. 451. n. 130

done herein, but make a way, and shew an occasion to carpe at the Synodall Acts of the fift Councell: and had not the Cardinall beene conscious of this fault in this Action, you may be well assured that he would not have omitted so foule an error in the fift Synod, and the Acts thereof, as to avouch *Domnus* to have beene dead before the Councell of *Chalcedon*, when hee scraped and raked together all that he could finde (and they are all but mores to this beame) whereby he might disgrace those Acts.

247. 451. N. 130

10. But the Cardinall will not for all this yeeld in this matter, nay he will defend this Action also: For objecting <sup>x</sup> to himselfe how any such Action could be held concerning *Domnus*, seeing *Iustinian* testifieth hee was dead before the Councell of *Chalcedon*, hee answereth, *Iustinian* was ignorant of this Action, and he had some other Action of the Councell of *Chalcedon* touching *Domnus*, *Quam nusquam legimus*, Which we no where finde. So *Baronius*: Who hereby would have it thought, that *Iustinian* and the fift Councell had not the true Copies of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, but that these which the Cardinall frameth, they are the onely perfect and entire Acts thereof. Certainly *Iustinian* was ignorant of this Action, and so was the fift Councell. And no marvell, when the Councell of *Chalcedon* it selfe was ignorant thereof. And whether the Emperour and the whole fift generall Councell, wherein were present foure Patriarkes, and the Bishop of *Chalcedon* also, whether these living about an hundred yeares after that Councell, bee not like to have had more true Copies of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, than *Baronius*, living eleven hundred yeares after it, it is not hard to judge.

y Ex quibus apparet *Iustinianum* alicuius alterius actionis, quam nusquam legimus, cognitionem habuisse. Bar. loc. cit.

a Ali. 10. pa. 115.

b Ibid.

11. Now for that which the Cardinall would perswade, that whereas *Iustinian* and the fift Synod sayd, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* condemned *Domnus* after he was dead, they sayd this, as he supposeth, out of some other Action <sup>y</sup> of *Chalcedon*, which is not now extant, and thereby would blemish the Acts of the Councell of *Chalcedon* as being defective, and wanting that Action: Truly his Cardinallship is foully mistaken herein. Neither *Iustinian*, nor the fift Councell, had any such Action, as he vainly and idly dreameth of. It was these very Acts which now wee have, out of which they affirme that. For they say not that the Councell did that in any action particularly concerning *Domnus*, nor yet that in expresse termes they condemned *Domnus*: But they say, the Councell condemned him, and so they did, in that they approved both his condemnation and deposition decreed in the Ephesine Latrocinie. That this they did the acts now extant doe declare; whereas <sup>a</sup> the most holy Bishops of *Rome* accounted all that was done in the second Ephesine Synod to be void, it is manifest that the judgement concerning the Bishop of *Amiob* is excepted; so sayd the Popes Legates, and Stephen <sup>b</sup>, I also judge those things to be voyd which were done at *Ephesus*, absque his quæ gesta sunt adversus *Domnum*, excepting: those things which were done against *Domnus*: and to the like effect sayd they all. *Domnus* then being dead, at the time of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, and having beene in the Ephesine Latrocinie, both condemned and deposed, seeing the Councell of *Chalcedon* approved both his condemnation and deposition, and the

sub.

substitution of *Maximus*, (which were all done in that Ephesine La-  
trocinie,) as just and lawfull: hence it is that the fift Councell sayth,  
and that out of these very Acts and no other, as themselves explaine,  
that the Fathers at *Chalcedon* condemned *Domnus* being dead, whose  
condemnation they approved, when at that time of their approving  
it hee was dead. So neither are the Acts of the fourth Councell im-  
perfect, nor these of the fift untrue; in affirming this of *Domnus*;  
but that Vaticane and Gibeonitish Action, inserted into the Acts  
of *Chalcedon*, and approved by *Baronius* and *Binius*, is both false, ridi-  
culous, and impossible.

c Chalcedonen-  
sis Synodus  
Domnum con-  
demnavit, cum  
confirmasset con-  
demnationem  
ejus, & susce-  
pisset Maximi  
ordinationem.  
Cone. 4. Cell. 8.  
pa. 575.

12. The last whom I will now mention, is *Anastasius*, the writer  
of the lives of their Popes. An author whom *Baronius* much follow-  
eth, and relyeth upon, almost in all parts of his Annals: whom I doe  
not mention in this place, as doubting whether those lives are truly  
his, but as doubting, nay rather without doubt assuring both my selfe  
and others, that such credit is not to be given to him and to his  
reports, as the Cardinall and *Binius* doe give. This I doubt not to  
demonstrate, if ever I come to handle the second Nicene Synod;  
and that which they call the eighth; wherein *Anastasius* was a stickler,  
yea and the penner of the one, and correcter of the other: For this  
present, I will onely examine the life of *Vigilius* written by him;  
wherein I doe constantly affirme; that there are not so many lines as  
lyes set downe by *Anastasius*. Which that it may appeare that I doe  
not speake in any spleene against *Anastasius*, but out of the evidencē  
of truth, give me leave to take a view of some particulars therein;  
those especially which most concerne this our present cause.

13. First, *Anastasius* describing the entrance of *Vigilius* to have  
beene *codem tempore*, at that time when *Bellisarius* made warre against  
*Vitiges* the King of the *Gothes*, sayth that *Vitiges* fled away by night, but  
*Iohn* surnamed the bloody, pursued after him, and brought him to *Bellisari-  
us* and *Vigilius* at Rome; and there *Bellisarius* tooke the Sacrament to  
bring him safe to *Iustinian*. All untrue. First, it is untrue that *Vi-  
tiges* fled away by night; or secondly, that hee fled at all; or third-  
ly, that *Iohn* did pursue him in flight; or fourthly, that *Iohn* tooke  
him; or fifthly, that *Iohn* brought him to *Bellisarius*; or sixthly, that  
hee brought him to *Vigilius*; or seventhly, that he brought him to  
Rome; or eightly, that *Bellisarius* tooke any such oath; or ninthly,  
any Sacrament; or tenthly, tooke it in the Church of *Iulius*; or e-  
leventhly, tooke it to assure them that hee would bring *Vitiges* to  
*Iustinian*: all these are the fictions of *Anastasius*: For as *Procopius* who  
was Counsellor to *Bellisarius*, and present with him in all his warres,  
testifieth, *Vitiges* and the *Gothes* willingly yeelded<sup>f</sup> themselves and  
*Ravenna* unto *Bellisarius*; yea *Vitiges* perswaded and even entreated  
him to accept the kingdome: and *Bellisarius* tooke *Vitiges* & himselfe;  
and kept him in custody: yea he sent away *Iohn*<sup>h</sup> and *Narses* before ei-  
ther he entred in *Ravenna*, or tooke *Vitiges*, and being taken, he cari-

d Anast. in vita  
Vigil. Nam A-  
nastasius con-  
tinuavit histori-  
am Damasi, ab  
obitu Damasi  
usque ad Adri-  
anum secundum.  
Poss. in App.  
e Bellisario  
consiliarius ad-  
fuit Procopius,  
& rebus omni-  
bus dum age-  
rentur inter-  
fuit. Procop.  
lib. 1. de bellis  
Persico;

quoque formidine percitus Bellisarium et ipse ad suscipiendum imperium hortatur. Proc. lib. 2. Bell. Goth. pa. 340. qui paulo  
post quomodo se torpiter dediderant Vitiges et Gothi declarat: idem docet Leon. Aret. lib. 1. de bello Ital. pa. 669. g Belli-  
sarius Ravenna positus Vitigem imprimis honorifice custoditum servabat. ibid. pa. 341. h Bellisarius Johannem & Nar-  
setem diversim abire cum suis copiis iussit. His ab omnibus Ravennam contendit. ib. p. 340. idem et Leon. Aret. loc. citato.



i Bellif. iter eg-  
greditur, Bizan-  
tiumq. reſſa con-  
tendit. *ibid.* pa.  
343. et cum Vi-  
ſige Goiborumq.  
optimatibus Bi-  
zantium venit.  
*Idem* lib. 3. pa.  
343. Bellifarius  
cum Viſige Bi-  
zantium navi-  
gavit. *Leo. Arct.*  
*loc. cit.*

k Bellifario ad ſe  
clerius vocato.  
*Proc. lib. 2. pa.*  
341. et *Leonar.*  
*Arct. pa. 670.*  
Iuſtinianus Bel-  
liſarium ex Ita-  
lia conſeſſum re-  
vocavit.

l Nam Silverii  
a Bellifario e-  
ſſum narrat.  
*Proc. lib. 1. pa.*  
287. eiq. tum  
ſufficiens Vigi-  
lius. *ibid.* Id ſa-  
lum an. 3. belli-  
ſarb. vel ante.  
liquet ex lib. 2.  
pa. 313. ubi ſic  
ait, Iam tertius  
huc annus  
exibat.

m Nam Silve-  
rius obiit an. 14.  
Iuſtiniani. *Bar.*  
an. 540. n. 2. at  
Viſigem cepit et  
Conſtantinopol.  
adduxit Belliſa-  
rius an. 15. Iu-  
ſtiniani. *Bar. an.*  
541. n. 3.

n Liber. in Brev.  
ec. 22.

o Hoc anno (14.  
Iuſtiniani) ſe-  
mulac de legiti-  
ma Vigiſii ele-  
ctione nuncium  
Conſtantinopol.  
perlatus eſt, im-  
perator protinus  
Epiſtolam ad eū  
dat. *Bar. an.*  
540. n. 11.

q Epiſt. Vigiſii  
exiat apud. *Bar.*  
an. 540. n. 20.  
ſeq.

r Nam litera ad  
Menam data  
ſunt 15. Kalend. Ofi. Iuſtino Conſule, id eſt, an. 14. Iuſtiniani. *Bar. an. 540. n. 25.* Bellifarius autem Conſtantinopol. redit Con-  
ſul. Baſilio, id eſt, an. 15. Iuſtin. *Bar. an. 541. n. 3.* ſ. Paet quod ipſe Imperator Bellifario hac de cauſa gratias non egit. *Bin. Not.*  
in vitago Vigiſii. S. Gratius.

ed him not to Rome, but the ſtraight way by Sea to <sup>i</sup> *Conſtantinople*, whither himſelfe was then <sup>k</sup> called by the Emperour, and commanded to come without any delay. So in the very entrance of his narra- tion, *Anaſtaſius* hath in few words couched together at the leaſt ten or eleven evident untruths.

14. Next, *Anaſtaſius* relates, how the Emperour and his wife demanded of *Belliſarius* when he came to *Conſtantinople*, how he had placed *Vigilius* in ſtead of *Silverius*, and thanked him for it. Truly *Anaſtaſius* had ſmall wit to thinke that the Emperour had leaſure to confer with *Belliſarius* concerning a matter done about three <sup>l</sup> yeares before: and ſpecially which with the death of *Silverius* <sup>m</sup> was now dead and buried. Yet ſay he did, Againe, what an idle diſcourſe was this about the placing of *Vigilius* in the roome of *Silverius*, ſeeing the Emperour knew the whole mat- ter long before, how *Silverius* was baniſhed, upon an accuſation of a Letter written to the Gothiſh King, to come and take poſſeſſion of Rome, and himſelfe had taken order that the cauſe of *Silverius* ſhould be againe examined, and if that letter was truly writ by *Silverius*, that he ſhould be baniſhed; if it were found a calumny, that he ſhould be reſtored, as *Liberatus* <sup>n</sup> ſheweth. Hee knew <sup>o</sup> alſo that *Silverius* was dead, and that *Vigilius* was peaceably and with his conſent placed in the Romane See before *Belliſarius* came, for hee had writtento unto him as the onely lawfull Pope, and both the Emperour and *Menas* had received Letters <sup>q</sup> from him the yeare <sup>r</sup> before. But *Anaſtaſius* thought the Emperours diſcourſes to be as idle as his owne. Beſides, whereas he addes that the Emperour thanked him for pla- cing of *Vigilius* in the roome of *Silverius*; *Binius* is bould there- in to tell *Anaſtaſius* of his untruth, ſeeing all that, as he ſaith <sup>b</sup>, was done without the knowledge of *Iuſtinian*, by the plotting of *Theodora*. I will account theſe for no more than two un- truths.

15. After this, *Anaſtaſius* tells us that *Iuſtinian* then ſent *Belliſarius* a- gaine into *Aſricke*, who coming thither killed by trechery *Gontharis* King of the *Vandalls*, and then coming to Rome offered ſome of the ſpoiles of the *Vandalls* to Saint Peter by the hands of Pope *Vigilius*, to wit, a Croſſe of gold ſeſet with precious ſtones, being a hundred pound in waight, wherein were writ his victories, two great ſilver tables gilded, which unto this day ſtand, ſaith hee, before the body of Saint Peter: alſo hee gave many other gifts, and many almes to the poore, and built an hoſpittall in the broad way, and a Monastery of Saint *Iurvenalis* at the City of *Orta*, where hee gave poſ- ſeſſions, and many gifts. Thus *Anaſtaſius*, whoſe narration as it muſt needs teſtifie in what great honour the Romane Church was in thoſe ancient times, and how bountifull they were then unto it, ſo may it ſerve for an incentive to inflame the zeale of Emperours, and great perſons to doe the like after their victories and conqueſts; and no doubt but by ſuch lyes and fables as this is their Church had gained the beſt part of her treasures and poſſeſſions; for all this not one ſylla- ble is true or probable. *Belliſarius* when hee came to *Conſtantinople*

with

with *Vitiges* was not then sent into the West, but into *Persia* against *Cosroes*, as *Procopius*, who was present with him, testifieth, and in those warres hee continued full three yeares: When hee was sent Westward hee was not sent into *Africk*, for thither *Ariobindus* was sent, with whom was sent *Artabanus*: Neither did *Bellisarius* either by villany or victorie kill *Gontharis*, but *Artabanus* killed him treacherously when they sat together at a feast in *Gontharis* Chamber: nor came *Bellisarius* from *Africk* to *Rome*, (for after his second coming (which was from *Constantinople*) into *Italy*, he stayed there till his returne to *Bizantium* five yeares after, and returned backe no more<sup>a</sup>) nor brought hee thence with him any of the spoyle of the Vandales; nor offered hee them to *Saint Peter*; nor offered he, by the hand of *Vigilius* either that golden Crosse of an hundred pound waight (which is a golden lye, consisting of an hundred latches) nor the silver table, nor those many other gifts, nor built he an Hospitall; nor gave hee either possessions or donations. All these, if they be well summed, will make at least twelve grand capitall mother lyes, which have many moe in their wombs; such an art of devising untruths hath *Anastasius*. Or if this oblation bee referred, as *Binius*<sup>b</sup> saith perhaps it ought, to the time when *Bellisarius* wanne *Rome* from *Vitiges*, which was, as *Procopius*<sup>c</sup> sheweth in the third yeare of the warres against the *Goths*, and 12. of *Iustinian*, yet this can excuse no one of all the untruths of *Anastasius*; for neither then was *Vigilius* but *Sylverius*<sup>d</sup> the Pope, neither did *Bellisarius* then come out of *Africk*, or bring the spoyle of the Vandals with him, of which this oblation was made by the hands of Pope *Vigilius*:

16. Next to this, *Anastasius* saith, *eodem tempore Theodora scripsit, at that same time Theodora the Emperesse writ to Vigilius to come to Constantinople, and restore Anthimus to his See, but Vigilius refused, saying, I spake foolishly before when I promised that, but now I can no way consent to restore an heretike*: Whence *Baronius*<sup>e</sup> observes a rare miracle, that *Vigilius* was now turned to a new man, & now *Saul* was one of the Prophets, of a blasphemers chaged to a true Preacher, of a *Saul* into a *Paul*; all which change proceeded from his very sitting in the Popes Chaire, *momento temporis novam formam accepit, at that very moment when he became the true Pope, hee had a new forme, a new speech*, and then prophesied consonantly to the fathers: and the like miracle doth *Binius*<sup>f</sup> note, *statim ut sanctam sedem ascendit, as soone as ever Vigilius had stept into the holy Chaire, hee was wholly changed into a new man, and then condemned the heresies, which before hee approved*. A right *Neantes* indeed, of whom it is written, that before being *ὄρος οὐδὲς ἔσται*; having

*erat in conclavi, ubi tres mensa parata, ipse in prima accubuit, cui Albani sum & Artabanum adhibuit. Artabanus Gontharidem adcessit, quasi clam ei aliquid dixerat, Gontharidi saucio exilire conanti Artabanus enses educens latus dextrum capulo tenuis confodit, ex quo ille statim moritundus cecidit. Proc. lib. 4. de bello Vandal. pa. 243. 2 Bellisarius Bizantium venit, quum per quinquennium ex Italia nusquam adcessisset. Proc. lib. 3. de bell. Goth. pa. 392. sicque 14. annu hujus belli exibat. Ibid. pa. 394. a Bizantium cum pervenisset, ibi diutius commoratus, ex otio vivere, et in delictis affluentibus opibus agere, rebus ante hac feliciter gessit, contentus. Proc. ibid. pa. 393. b Bin. not. in vitam Vigily. § De spolys. c Vrbz Roma recuperata a Gothis per Bellisarium post annum sexagesimum quo eam tenuerunt Gothi, et post Iustiniani annum undecimum. Proc. lib. 1. de bell. Goth. pa. 171. et post hac ait, Jamque tertius hujus bello annus exibat. Lib. 2. pa. 313. d Duo decimus annus Iustiniani respondet anno 2. Sylverij. Bar. an. 538. nu. 1. Sylverius autem sedit annos 3. Bar. an. 540. nu. 2. e An. 540. nu. 13. f Bin. not. in vit. Vig. pa. 478.*

*Bellisarius Vitigem capitulum eo tempore Bizantium duxit quando Iustinianus Cosroem audivit bellum novisse. Proc. lib. 2. Bell. Pers. pt. 156. Imperator res Orientis in duos duxit duces, circa fluvium Euphratem omnia Bellisario tradidit regenda. Ibid. pa. 158.*

*Utoilius cum exercitus parte ad loca Roma vicina tendit, ejus professione cognita, Imperator, eisi adhuc fortissimè sibi infestis ibi Persi, misere rursus in Italiam Bellisarium cogitavit. Jamq. novus hujus belli annus exibat. Proc. lib. 3. de bell. Goth. pa. 396. redierat autem ex Italia Constantinopolim anno 6. belli Gothici, ut liquet ex Proc. lib. 2. in fine, et lib. 3. in initio.*

*x Imperator Ariobindum ducem in Africam misit, & Artabanum, sed inutile putans duorum ducum Imperio res administrari, Ariobindum totius Africa curam delegavit. Proc. de bell. Vand. lib. 2. pa. 239. y Convivium*

*Artabanus Gontharidem adcessit, quasi clam ei aliquid dixerat, Gontharidi saucio exilire conanti Artabanus enses educens latus dextrum capulo tenuis confodit, ex quo ille statim moritundus cecidit. Proc. lib. 4. de bello Vandal. pa. 243. 2 Bellisarius Bizantium venit, quum per quinquennium ex Italia nusquam adcessisset. Proc. lib. 3. de bell. Goth. pa. 392. sicque 14. annu hujus belli exibat. Ibid. pa. 394. a Bizantium cum pervenisset, ibi diutius commoratus, ex otio vivere, et in delictis affluentibus opibus agere, rebus ante hac feliciter gessit, contentus. Proc. ibid. pa. 393. b Bin. not. in vitam Vigily. § De spolys. c Vrbz Roma recuperata a Gothis per Bellisarium post annum sexagesimum quo eam tenuerunt Gothi, et post Iustiniani annum undecimum. Proc. lib. 1. de bell. Goth. pa. 171. et post hac ait, Jamque tertius hujus bello annus exibat. Lib. 2. pa. 313. d Duo decimus annus Iustiniani respondet anno 2. Sylverij. Bar. an. 538. nu. 1. Sylverius autem sedit annos 3. Bar. an. 540. nu. 2. e An. 540. nu. 13. f Bin. not. in vit. Vig. pa. 478.*

now got the harpe of *Orpheus*, hee thought he was also able to worke wonders therewith, as well as *Orpheus* had done; he would needs then; *Saxa movere sono testudinis*, but all in vaine: Even so *Peters* Chaire made *Vigilius* as infallible as *Peter* himselfe, being once set there hee could doe nothing else but drop Oracles, and his fidling on *Orpheus* harpe made an heavenly harmony, but how hee failed in his skill, and proved no better than *Neanthes*, his Constitution touching the *Three Chapters* is an eternall record, and yet all that time hee sat in the Chaire and prophesied, for as the common saying is, *Vbi Papa, ibi Roma*; so it is as true, *Vbi Papa, ibi Cathedra*, it is more easie for the Pope to take the Chaire with him, than, like an Elephant, to carry the whole City of *Rome* upon his backe to *Constantinople*, and goe up and downe the world with it.

17. But is this narration, thinke you, of *Anastasius* true? verily not one word therein; neither did the Empresse write, nor *Vigilius* answer any such thing, for both these were done, as *Anastasius* saith, *eodem tempore, at, or after that same time*, when *Bellisarius*, having killed *Gontharis*, came out of *Africk*, and offered thoe spoiles of the *Vandales*, and seeing, that, as wee have proved, was never; this writing of *Theodora* and answer of *Vigilius* was at the same tide of *Nevermas*. Againe, this answer of *Vigilius* was given, *statim ac sanctam sedem ascendit*, at his very first placing in the See, as *Binius* sheweth, and that was in the fourteenth<sup>e</sup> yeare of *Iustinian*, for then *Sylverius* dyed: now seeing *Theodora* writ not this till *Gontharis* was overcome, and that was, as *Procopius*<sup>h</sup> sheweth, in the nineteenth yeare of *Iustinian*; it was a fine devise of *Anastasius*, to tell how this new Saint answered a letter (by way of prophesie) three or foure yeares before the letter was written. Further, *Vigilius*, as *Liberatus* saith<sup>i</sup>, *implens promissum suum, quod Augusta fecerat*, performing his promise to the Emperess, writ a letter in this manner, hee performed it as much as hee could, he laboured a while to doe it, and this was both before and a little after the death of *Sylverius*; but when hee could not effect it, and after that the Emperor had writ unto him to confirme the deposition of *Anthimus*: *Vigilius* seeing his labour to be lost therein, left off that care untill hee could have a better opportunity to overthrow the Councell of *Chalcedon*, which, so long as it stood in force, was a barre unto *Anthimus*. If *Vigilius* could have prevailed to have had the fift Councel and the Church approve his Constitution published in defence of the *Three Chapters*, by which the Councell of *Chalcedon* had beene quite overthrowne, then in likelihood he would have set up *Anthimus*, & all who with *Anthimus* had oppugned the Councell of *Chalcedon*, but till that were done, till the Councell were repealed, *Vigilius* saw it was in vaine to strive for *Anthimus*; and therefore waiting for another opportunity for that, hee in two severall Epistles, the one to *Iustinian*, the other to *Mennas*, confirmed, as the Emperor required him to doe, the deposition of *Anthimus*; and this hee did the yeare before *Bellisarius* returned to *Constantinople* with *Vitiges*, namely in the fourteenth yeare of<sup>k</sup> *Iustinian*, and five yeares before the death of *Gontharis*. Would the Empresse then write to him to come and doe that which he knew not

g Bar. an. 54.  
nu. 2.

h Hoc modo (ce-  
de nimirum  
Gotharidis et al-  
liorum) Artaba-  
nes Caribaginem  
Iustiniano resti-  
tuit anno ipsius  
decimo nono.  
Proc. lib. 2. de  
Bell. Pandul.  
p. 244.  
et Liberat. ca. 22.

k Ante proba-  
tum est hoc cap.

not



not onely the Emperour most constantly withstood, but *Vigilius* also, to have five yeares before publicly testified to the Emperour, that hee would not doe? specially seeing, as *Baronius*<sup>1</sup> saith, *Vigilius* by that his letter to the Emperour, *Omnem prorsus, siue Theodora, siue alijs spem ademisset, would put both Theodora, and all else out of all hope*, that he should ever performe his promise in restoring *Anthimus*. So although those words, *codem tempore*, were not (as they ought to be) referred to the time after the killing of *Gontharis*, but to the time when *Belisarius* came with *Vitiges* to *Constantinople*, which was the yeare<sup>m</sup> after *Vigilius* his letter sent to the Emperour; yet the *Anastasian* narration is not onely untrue, but wholly improbable, that *Theodora* should then send to him to come and restore *Anthimus*, who had the yeare before confirmed the deposing of *Anthimus*; and professed both to the Emperour and *Mennas*, that hee would not restore him, and that he ought not to bee restored. Lastly, at this time when *Anastasius* faineth *Theodora* to write to *Vigilius* to come and restore *Anthimus*, (which following the death of *Gontharis*, must needs bee in the nineteenth or twentieth yeare of *Iustinian*) the cause of *Anthimus* was quite forgotten and laid aside, and the *Three Chapters* were then in every mans mouth, and every where debated: The Emperour having in that nineteenth yeare, as by *Victor*<sup>n</sup>, who then lived, is evident, if not before; published his Ediēt, and called *Vigilius* about that matter to *Constantinople*. *Anastasius* dreamed of somewhat, and hearing of some writing, or sending to *Vigilius* about that time, he not knowing, or, which I rather thinke, willing to corrupt and falsifie the true narration, for his great love to the Pope, conceales the true and onely cause about which the message was sent to *Vigilius*, and deviseth a false and fained matter about *Anthimus*, and endeavors to draw al men by the noise of that from harkning after the cause of the *Three Chapters*, which he saw would prove no small blemish to the *Romane See*. Iust as *Alcibiades*<sup>o</sup> to avoyd a greater infamy, cut off the taile of his beautifull dog, which cost him 70. minas *Atticæ*, (that is of our coyne p 2 18. pound and 15. shillings) and filled the mouthe of the people with that trifle, that there might bee no noise of his other disgrace. The true cause of sending to *Vigilius*, as *Victor* sheweth<sup>q</sup>, was about the *Three Chapters*, this of *Anthimus*, which *Anastasius* harpes upon, is in truth no other but the dogs taile, and the din of it hath a long time possessed the eares of men; but now the true cause being come to the open view, fills the world with that shamefull heresie of *Vigilius*, which *Anastasius* would have concealed and covered with his dogs taile. But enough of this passage, wherein there are not so few as twenty lyes.

18. The next passage in *Anastasius* contains the sending for *Vigilius*, and the manner how hee was taken from *Rome* and brought to *Constantinople*: He tells us that the people of *Rome* taking this opportunity of the displeasure of *Theodora* against him for his former consenting to restore *Anthimus*, suggested divers accusations against him, as that by his Counsell *Sylvester* was deposed, and that hee was a murderer, and had killed his Nephew *Asterius*, whereupon the Emperesse sent *Anthimus Scribo* to take

1 Bar. an. 540. nu. 22.

m Nam litera  
Vigili missa Iu-  
stiniano sunt an.  
14. Iust. m. m. n.  
Bar. an. 540. nu.  
14. Belisarius  
autem redit Con-  
stantinopolim  
cum V. iuge an.  
Iustiniani 15.  
Bar. an. 541.  
nu. 3.

n Iustinianus  
Vigilium con-  
pelit ut ad urbē  
regiam propera-  
ret. an. 4. post  
Consulatum Ba-  
sily. V. i. in Chr.  
in eum an. is au-  
tem est an. 19.  
Iustiniani se-  
cundum Bar. an.  
545. nu. 1.

o Plut. in Alcib.  
p Nam mina At-  
tica valet nostri  
nummi 3. l. 2. s.  
6. d. ut testatur  
Edovatdus  
Breirwooddus in  
lib. suo de Pand.  
ca. 4. quem lib. ii  
accuratē admo-  
dum hæc trala-  
re, non est cur  
doli dubitaret.  
q Imperator Vi-  
gilius ad regiam  
urbem compellit  
venire, ut tria  
Capitula candē-  
naret. V. i. in  
Chron. an. 4. post  
Coss. Basily.

Trium Capitulum  
lorum causā  
tantum vocatus  
est. Bin. not. in  
vita Vigily.  
§ Tunc Romani.  
Non alia causā  
professionis Vigily  
Constantinopolim cognoscitur.  
Bar. an. 546.  
nu. 55.  
1 Bar. an. eodem  
546. nu. 54.  
2 Putavit Vigily  
um, quibus pos-  
set fieri blandi-  
tiji concilian-  
dum. Bin. loc. cit.  
Eum sibi quibus  
valuit, studuit  
conciliare blan-  
ditijs. Bar. an.  
546. nu. 55.  
u Ba. an. eo. n. 54  
x Bar. an. eod.  
546. nu. 60.  
y Interea Vigily  
us ab Imperato-  
re ex Sicilia e-  
vocatus, Bizanti-  
um venit. Nam  
ut eo contende-  
rent, diutinam  
in ea insula  
traxerunt morā.  
Proc. lib. 3. de  
Bell. Goth. p. 364.  
Evocatus autem  
fuit circa finem  
an. 11. bell. Goth.  
ut liquet, ex pra-  
cedentibus verbis;  
unde: imus huius  
belli se verterat  
annus. Interea  
Vigily, &c.  
Iam 11. illius  
belli est Iustinia-  
ni 20. nam bellū  
capit anno ejus  
nono prope fini-  
to, ut testatur.  
Proc. lib. 1. Bell.  
Goth. pa. 252.  
Imperator se ad  
bellum parat,  
annos novenos  
potius Imperio.  
2 Victor loc. cit.  
etiam et Marcel-  
linus anno prior  
evocatum ab  
Imperatore, sed  
sequenti Constā.  
venisse expressē  
docet. In Chron.  
an. 546. et  
147.

him wheresoever hee were, except onely in the Church of Saint Peter. Scribo came and tooke him in the end of November, and after many indignities both in words and actions, as that the people cast stones, and clubs, and dung after him, wishing all evill to goe with him; hee in this violent manner was brought to Sicilie, in December, and on Christmas eve to Constantinople, whom the Emperour then meeting, they kissed and wept one over the other for joy, and then they led him to the Church of Saint Sophie, the people singing an hymne, behold the Lord commeth. Thus Anastasius. Which whole narration to bee a very lying and dunghill legend, were easie to demonstrate, if Baronius and Binus had not much eased us in this part, for they not onely condemne this as untrue, but prove it by divers arguments to be such. The first, for that Vigily was called to Constantinople onely for the cause of the Three Chapters, and therefore Anastasius putting downe other causes thereof, *aperti mendacij arguitur*, is convinced of an evident untruth. The second, because seeing, as they say, Menas and the chiefe Easterne Bishops would not subscribe to the Edict of the Emperour untill the Pope had consented, Iustinian would conciliate the Pope unto him by all faire meanes, and intreate him no otherwise but favourably, least if the Pope were displeased, he should not yeeld his consent, and then the whole purpose of the Emperour should bee made frustrate. Their third reason is an argument *à testimonio negativè*, because neither Procopius nor Facundus mention any such violence or abuse offered to the Pope, of which reason I have spoken before. A fourth is taken from the time; whereas he saith, that Vigily came to Constant. on Christmas eve, *mendacij redarguitur*, hee is proved to lye, by that which Procopius saith. Many other reasons might bee added, but these of Baronius and Binus are sufficient to convince Anastasius of lying, and open lying in this passage, which is, as now you see, nothing but a fardell of lyes; for neither did the people take that oportunitie to accuse Vigily, nor did they accuse him of those crimes, nor did the Empresse for that cause send for Vigily, neither did shee, but Iustinian call him to Constantinople, neither did shee send Anthimus Scribo to pull him away by violence, neither commanded she him not to forbear Vigily in any place, but only in Saint Peters Church (this was bnt the kind affection of Anastasius to the honour of Peters See) neither did shee sweare to excommunicate Scribo if hee brought not Vigily, neither did Scribo apprehend him in the Temple of Saint Cicile, neither did Vigily distribute a largesse at that time when he was apprehended, neither did they violently carry him to Tiber and there ship him, neither did the people follow him, and desire him to pray for them; neither when the ship was gone, did they revile him, nor cast stones, nor clubs, nor dung after him, nor imprecate and curse him, neither was hee at that time brought, but as by Procopius appeareth, long before hee voluntarily went to Sicilie, and made so long stay there, that the Emperour having called him the yeare before, as by Victor is cleare, by reason of his long abode in Sicilie, he called him the yeare after againe out of Sicily, as Procopius sheweth. Neither came he to Constantinople on Christmas Eeve, but either on the five and twentieth of January, as

Marcellinus<sup>a</sup> saith, or as by Procopius, who is farre more worthy of credit, may bee gathered<sup>b</sup> about the middle of April next ensuing; neither did the Emperour when they met, kisse him, nor did they weepe for joy, the one of the other, nor did they sing the hymne of *Ecce advenit Dominus Dominator, behold the Lord the Ruler is come*. It was a very pretty allusion of *Anastasius*, and very apt for the season, in honour of the Pope to take part of the text expressing the joy for Christs Advent in the flesh, and turne it to an *Anthem* to congratulate the Popes Advent on Christmas eve to *Constantinople*, but I feare it will hardly be beleevd, that men in those dayes did use such base, nay, blasphemous flattery to the Pope; this hymne would have better besitted the time of *Leo* the tenth, when in the open Councell they durst say<sup>c</sup>, to Pope *Leo*, Weepe not O daughter Syon, *Ecce venit Leo de Tribu Iuda, behold the Lion of the Tribe of Iuda commeth*, the roote of *Iesse*; behold God hath raised up to thee a Saviour, who shall save thee from the hands of the destroying Turks, and deliver thee from the hand of the Persecutors; O most blessed *Leo*, wee have looked for thee, we have hoped that thou shouldest come and be our deliverer. The former *Anthem* had beene furable to such a time; the art of their blasphemous *Gnatonisme* to the Popes; was not halfe learned in *Iustinians* dayes, and most incredible it is, that *Iustinian* would use, or could endure in his presence, such entertainment of *Vigilius*, knowing that hee was an earnest and violent oppugner of his Imperiall Edict, in which he had expressely anathematized and accursed all that did defend the *Three Chapters*. This proclaiming of an *Anathema* against *Vigilius*, and the hymne of *Ecce advenit Dominus Dominator*, with kissing & weeping for joy, make no good concord nor harmony together. Let this be accotinted for no moe than twenty *Anastasian* lyes, and those are the fewest which are bound up in this fardle.

19. After that *Anastasius* hath, as you have seene, safely landed the Pope at *Constantinople*, then hee tels you, That for two yeares space there was continuall strife about *Anthimus*, the Emperour and Empresse laboured to have *Vigilius* restore him, urged him with his promise and handwriting, but *Vigilius* would no way consent; and when he found them so heavy towards him, he said, I perceive now it was not *Iustinian* and *Theodora*, but *Dioclesian* and *Eleutheria* that called mee hither, doe with me what you will: thereupon they buffeted him, and called him homicide, and killer of *Sylvester*; then hee fled to the Church of *Euphemia*, and held himselfe by a Pillar of the Altar, but they puld him thence, cast him out of the Church, put a rope about his necke, dragged him through all the City till evening, and then put him in prison, feeding him with a little bread and water, and after this they banished him also with the rest of the *Romane* Clergy. And these, like the rest, are meerely the fond and sottish dreames of *Anastasius*, or, as *Baronius* useth to call them, lyes. *Baronius* will assure you, that it was not *Anthimus* or his restoring, but the *Three Chapters* about which *Vigilius* was sent for. The cause of *Anthimus*, who was deposed tenne<sup>d</sup> yeares before, was quite forgotten: and to see the sottishnesse of *Anastasius*, *Iustinian* had long before<sup>e</sup> written to *Vigilius*, requiring him to confirme the deposition of *Anthimus*, *Vigilius*<sup>f</sup> had done this upon the Emperours

<sup>a</sup> *Vigilius Constantinopolim ingressus est 8. Calend. Febr.*  
<sup>b</sup> Nam adventus Vigily Constantinopolim ponitur a Procopio, in initio 12. anni belli Gothic, lib. 3. pa. 364.  
<sup>c</sup> Jam 12. an. illius belli: choatur in fine anni 20. Iustiniani, is autem imperare cepit 1. die Aprilis, ut docet Marcell. in Chr. an. 527.  
<sup>d</sup> Conc. Later. sub Leone 10. Iess. 6. in Qrat. Simonis Bery.

<sup>d</sup> *Anthimus depositus in Cons. Constant. sub Menno, A.D. 4. an post. Conf. Basilij, qui est primus belli Gothic, Vigilius autem venit Constantinopolim an. 520. ejusdem belli.*  
<sup>e</sup> Anno 540. Bar. in il. l. vii. an. 527. Bar. an. 527. 13.



f Bar. an. 552.  
 nu. 16.  
 g In Basilica S.  
 Euphemia, qua  
 est Chalcedo-  
 ne habitare  
 disposuit Vigili-  
 us, Bar. an. 552.  
 nu. 8.  
 h Confugit Chal-  
 cedonem in Ba-  
 silicam S. Eu-  
 phemiae, Bin.  
 Not. in vitam  
 Vigily & Tunc  
 dedit.  
 i Imperator dig-  
 nam tanto Pon-  
 tifici legatione  
 ornauit, &c. At  
 Vigilius egredi  
 nunquam con-  
 sentit, nisi prius  
 &c. Bar. an. 553  
 nu. 11, 12.  
 k Hoc tempore  
 (vid. an. 552.)  
 accidisse noscitur  
 quae Anastasius  
 confudit cum  
 prioribus quae  
 acciderunt, vi-  
 uente Theodora.  
 Bar. an. 552. nu. 8  
 Theodora autem  
 obiit an. 548.  
 ut ait Bar. illo  
 anno nu. 21.  
 l Haec quae se-  
 quuntur contig-  
 erunt post obitum  
 Theodora, Bin.  
 not. in vitam  
 Vigily & Tunc  
 dedit.  
 m Agapetus al-  
 tercationem ca-  
 pit habere cum  
 Imperatore de  
 religione, &c.  
 Anast. in vita  
 Agapeti.

Emperours letter, the Popes letters are recorded both in *Baronius* and *Binius*, dated when *Iustinus* was Consull, which was fixe whole yeares before the Popes comming to *Constantinople*, all that time the Emperour still liked the deposing of *Anthimus*, and many wayes had approved *Mennas* for the Bishop. Now after all this, when the whole Church, and every man was troubled with a more waightry cause of the *Three Chapters*, *Anastasius* brings in this, that the Emperour, and the Pope quarrelled for two yeares, about an old forgotten matter of *Anthimus*, wherein there was a perfect concord betwixt them both: nay, that is nothing to quarrell, but that the Emperour, like *Dioclesian* should cause him to be beaten, to bee reviled, to be puld from the Altar and Sanctuary, and haled about the towne by a rope about his necke, imprison and banish him, and all for his refusing to doe that which the Emperour had decreed to be done, and commanded him to do the same, that for this cause their kisses should be turned into curses, and they both now weep a contrary weeping to their former, the Emperour wept because *Vigilius* would not doe that which the Emperour himselte commanded him not to doe, the Pope wept for that he was trailed in a rope about the towne, and all for not doing that which the Emperour would not have him to doe: Truly this surpasseth the degree of a fable or untruth. *Voraginenfis* himselte could not devise a more simple and sottish Legend.

20. If this doe not sufficiently perswade you of the untruth of this passage, see how *Baronius* and *Binius* doe contradict the same, for in this short narration are contained those *complura mendacia*, as *Baronius* calls<sup>f</sup> them, which writers, and first of all *Anastasius*, delivereth. The Church of *Euphemia*, whither the Pope fled, was, as *Anastasius* saith, one of the Churches in *Constantinople*: *Baronius* & and *Binius*<sup>h</sup> tels you, it was the Church in *Chalcedon*; *Anastasius* saith, the Pope was puld thence from the Altar. *Baronius*<sup>i</sup> tels you the Emperour sent a most honorable message to intreat him to come from thence, but the Pope refused, till the Emperour yeelded to his demands in recalling his E. dict. Lastly, *Baronius*<sup>k</sup> and *Binius*<sup>l</sup> will assure you, that the buffering of *Vigilius*, his fleeing to the Church of *Euphemia*, and their haling him from thence did all happen divers yeares, three at least after the death of *Theodora* the Empresse, but *Anastasius* referres all that to the time of *Theodora*, and makes her another *Eleutheria*, as great an agent in all this as *Dioclesian* himselte: belike as *Eleutheria* by a *metempsychosis*, was changed into *Theodora*, so *Theodora* by a like Necromanticall trick of *Anastasius* was raised out of her grave to buffer, to beate, and banish Pope *Vigilius* for not restoring *Anthimus*.

21. That which, as it seemes, gave occasion of this whole error to *Anastasius*, was a matter done by *Agapetus*: Hee when hee came to *Constantinople*, had much contention with the *Acephali*, who were opponents of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, among which *Anthimus* the Bishop of *Constantinople* was one, and a most earnest defender of that sect. It is not unlike but *Iustinian* at the first favoured *Anthimus*, untill he perceived him to be hereticall. *Anastasius*<sup>m</sup> further saith, that *Iustinian* favoured not onely the person, but the very heresie of *Anthimus*, and re-  
lates

lates certaine threatening words used by *Iustinian* against *Agapetus* for that cause, as if *Iustinian* had sayd, either consent to us, or I will banish thee; which the Pope answered in the same manner almost as *Vigilius* is sayd to have done, I thought I had come to *Iustinian*, but now I perceive I have found *Dioclesian*: upon which narration of *Anastasius*, *Baronius* \* and *Binius*, (having an implacable hatred to *Iustinian*), say, that he was suspected of heresie; and to cleare himselfe, he upon the Popes command<sup>o</sup>, published againe his profession of the true faith. But that neither *Anastasius* nor *Baronius* are herein to bee credited, may cleerly appeare, partly because *Iustinian* had before published an orthodoxall profession in the beginning<sup>p</sup> of the Popedom of *Agapetus*, and specially by that ample testimony, which is given him by the Easterne and orthodoxall Bishops in the Councell under *Mennas*, after the death of *Agapetus*, who<sup>a</sup> say of him, that *a primordiis regni sui usque nunc, from the very beginning of his Empire till then*; he studied to keepe the whole body of the Church sound, and intire, and free from all infection of heresies. So farre was he from supporting that heresie, or *Anthimus* in it, when he once knew him to defend the same. *Theodora* the Emperesse, by whose meanes *Anthimus* (who secretly oppugned the Councell of *Chalcedon*) was translated from *Trapezuntum* to *Constantinople*; she I say was indeed for a time more earnest for *Anthimus*, both to prevent his deposition, and after it was past, to have him restored by the meanes of *Vigilius*. *Liberatus* who then lived, saying nothing of the Emperours threats (which had *Iustinian* used, for the ill will *Liberatus* bare to *Iustinian*, he would not have omitted) expressly mentioneth<sup>r</sup> both how *Theodora* by rewards sought to corrupt *Agapetus*, and when that prevailed not, added threats therunto; and how the Pope would not at all consent to her motion. *Victor* <sup>f</sup>, who also lived at that time, saith that *Agapetus* *communione privavit, did excommunicate Theodora*, the patron of *Anthimus*, an oppugner of the Councell of *Chalcedon*: whence it may appeare, that *Anastasius* ascribes to the Emperour that which was done by the Emperesse, against *Agapetus*, and if any such words were used by *Agapetus*, as comparing their tyranny to *Dioclesians* persecution; it was spoken no way of *Iustinian*, (who was even then a most earnest defender of the true faith,) but of *Theodora*: who for a while laboured for *Anthimus*, and against the Councell of *Chalcedon*, till seeing that shee could not prevaile therein, neither by the meanes of *Agapetus*, nor *Silverius*, nor *Vigilius*, after he had once writ to the Emperour, his confirmation of the deposition of *Anthimus*, she then changed her mind, the cause of the three Chapters being then moved, she became as the Emperour himselfe was, an earnest condemner of the three Chapters, as by<sup>r</sup> *Victor* is evident, that is in truth an earnest defender of the Councell of *Chalcedon*. Now upon this truth (error alwayes having some truth for his ground) *Anastasius* \* buildeth many fabulous and poetical fictions of his owne devising: as that *Iustinian* and *Agapetus* quarrelled about the faith, *Agapetus* defending against him the two natures in Christ; that the Emperour threatned banishment to *Agapetus*, unless he would consent with him, and deny the two natures; that *A-*

*gapetus*

n Imperator ipse  
in suspicionem  
heresis est ad-  
ductus. Bar. an.  
536: nu. 18. et  
idem ait Binius  
Not. in vitam  
Agapeti. §. Hic  
missus. Et, apud  
eum voluit jussu  
pontificia. Bar.  
an. cit. nu. 19.  
o Non obtempe-  
rata Romano  
Pontifici, nefas  
vatus, editam  
confessionem ite-  
rat. Bar. an. 536:  
nu. 18.  
p Simulas Aga-  
petus est creatus  
Papa, Iustinia-  
nus rellæ fidei  
professionem Ro-  
mam misit. Bar.  
an. eod. nu. 18.  
q Ad. 1. p. 429.  
r Liber. ca. 21.  
Augusta clam  
promittente mu-  
nera, et versus  
Papæ (Agapeti)  
minas inten-  
tante.  
i Vict. Tur. in  
Chron. sub Cos.  
Iustin.

c Nam Victor  
asserit Theodo-  
ram laborasse ut  
tria Capitula  
condemnarentur.  
in suo Chron. sub  
an. 536: de Cos.  
Basilij.  
u Falsis Agi-  
peti

x Augustus adoravit beatissimū Agapetum Pa-  
pam. Anast. ibid.

y Bar. an. 547.  
nu. 49.

a Totilas crea-  
tus Rex Gothe-  
rum anno 7. belli  
Gothici. Proc.  
lib. 3. pa. 346.  
Is est annus Iust.  
16. ut ait Bar.  
an. 542. nu. 1.

Vigilius Bixan-  
tium venit anno  
12. belli Gothici.  
Proc. lib. 3. pa.  
364. is est Iusti-  
niani 21. & isto  
anno Constanti-  
nopolim venisse  
Vigiliū, ait  
Bar. an. 547. nu.  
26.

b Totilas Roman  
contendit quam  
statim obsedit.  
Procop. lib. 3.  
pa. 360. Per id  
tempus (obsi-  
dian) cum Vi-  
gilius in Sicilia  
esset. &c. lib. eod.  
pa. 364.

c Indictione 10.  
& 6. post Con-  
stantinū, anno, To-  
tilas Roman in-  
greditur. Marc.  
in Chron. Is est  
juxta eundem  
Marc. an. 547.  
cui consentit  
Bar. an. 547.  
nu. 22.

d Pueri se extri-  
ctis instructi ad  
portam Asina-  
riam duxit, &c.  
Proc. lib. 3. p. 372  
e Pueri in locum  
copios amnes  
cepit hostium  
insidias veritatem.  
Proc. ibid.

Agapetus called him *Dioclesian*; that *Agapetus* disputed with *Anthemius*, and overcame him before the Emperour; that the Emperour thereupon humbled himselfe to the Pope, and adored \* the most blessed *Agapetus*; that then hee banished *Anthemius*, and entreated *Agapetus* to consecrate *Mennas* in his roome. Now *Anastasius* perceiving these his fictions concerning *Iustinian* and *Agapetus*, wherein hee had some ground of truth; to be plausible, and his end being this, *Papa mi place- rer, quas fecisset fabulas*, hee brings in *Iustinian* and *Vigilius* to act the very same pageant againe; and that without any ground of truth, they for sooth, tenne yeares after *Anthemius* was depofed; and for ought ap- peareth was dead at that time, must come in quarrelling againe about *Anthemius*, as fresh as ever the Emperour and *Agapetus* had done be- fore: nay they must contend two other whole yeares after the former tenne: about this *Helena*, *Iustinian* and his Empresse must for want of variety of phraes be termed *Dioclesian* and *Eleutheria*, *Vigilius* must be buffeted and beaten, haled, dragged, imprisoned, and banished. Truly *Anastasius* had some ground for the act under *Agapetus*, for this of *Vigi- lius* he is beholding to none but his own poetickall pate; & left any little scene or shadow of resemblance might be wanting, *Baronius* supply- ing one defect in *Anastasius*, tells us how *Vigilius* for the same cause of *Anthemius*, excommunicated *Theodora* at his comming to *Constantinople*, even as *Agapetus* had done before. Who sees not all this to be nothing else but a *mimesis* of the acts of *Agapetus*, and a meere fiction of *Ana- stasius*? in which there are not so few as thirty lyes.

22. You have seene the tragicall part of this *Anastasian* fable, now followeth the *Catastrophe* or sudden change of all this hard fortune: *Tunc Gothi fecerunt*, then (saith he) the *Gothes* made *Totilas* their King, who comming to *Rome* besieged it so sore, that the City was pressed with a great famine, so that they did eate their owne children. *Totilas* entred the Citie, at the gate of *Saint Paul*, in the 13. Indiction, and for a whole night caused a Trumpet to be sounded, till all the *Romane* people were fled away, or hid in Churches. And *Totilas* dwelled with the *Romanes*, quasi pater cum filiis, even as a father with his children. Thus *Anastasius*. Who would not think by this narration that *Totilas* were made King after the beating, dragging, and imprisonment of *Vigilius*, and banishment of him & his fellows, upō which *Anastasius* presently adjoyneth, *Tunc Gothi fecerunt*, then the *Gothes* made *Totilas* King; and yet *Totilas* was King \* not onely before all that tragicall act, but foure or five yeares also before *Vigilius* came to *Constantinople*, or before the Emperour sent for him, and in like sort *Totilas* his besieging of *Rome* by *Anastasius* narration follows all the former: whereas by *Procopius* <sup>b</sup> it is evident that *Totilas* besieged *Rome* while *Vigilius* stayed in *Sicilie*, before he set forward to *Con- stantinople*. The like errour is in the note of the Indiction; for *Totilas* tooke the City, not as *Anastasius* saith in the 13. but as <sup>c</sup> *Marcellinus* witnesseth, and that aright, in the 10. Indiction: neither did he enter at the gate of *Saint Paul*, but as *Procopius* <sup>d</sup> expressly declareth, at that which was called *Asinaria*: neither did *Totilas* sound any such Trum- pet, to give them warning or space to flee, but entring the City in the night, and that by trechery of the watch, he stayed <sup>e</sup> his army toge- ther



ther till morning, for feare that some danger might befall himfelfe or his army in the darke, by the lying in wait of the enemies. And when after this, *Bellifarius* having recovered the City, *Totilas* againe wan it from the Romanes, which was three yeares after this, to wit, in the 15. yeare of the Gothicke warre; as *Procopius* <sup>f</sup>, sheweth, which was the 24. of *Iustinian*, whereas his first taking it was in the 21. of *Iustinian*; then indeed *Totilas*, as *Procopius* <sup>g</sup> declareth, caused divers Trumpets to sound an alarum on the river of Tyber in the night time, as if hee would on that side assault the City, while hee had his army in readinesse on the contrary side; and entred there by trechery also of the Watch; the Romanes giving little regard to that part. These Trumpets gave the occasion to *Anastasius* his fiction, which is so blockish, that what *Totilas* used as a warlike stratagem to deceive, and more easily to overthrow and kill the Romanes, that *Anastasius* in his simplicity takes and relates as done in favour of the Romanes, that they might escape and not be killed. And yet the taking of the City, whereof *Anastasius* speaketh, cannot be this second, wherein the Trumpets were sounded, but the former, (at which time *Totilas* used no such policie) as appeares by the famine which *Anastasius* <sup>h</sup> mentioneth, which happened in this former <sup>i</sup>, and not at this second taking of Rome by *Totilas*. So very incoherent and false is all that *Anastasius* writeth of this matter. But whereas *Anastasius* addes of King *Totilas* that hee dwelt among the Romanes as a father among his children, I know not how to checke so great a folly. The barbarous Gothes, after that long and miserable siege of the Romanes, having by trechery in the night entred the City, the very next <sup>k</sup> morning when they saw there was no danger of the enemy, *Quos obvios habent, obtruncant; killed all that they met*; and had made no end of slaughter, if *Pelagius* <sup>l</sup> comming in most submissive manner had not stayed their Gothish fury. The Romane people <sup>m</sup>, so many as could by flight, sought their safety: there remained of their innumerable Romane troupes, but to the number of five hundred, the Noblemen <sup>n</sup> and better sort who remained among them, led a life more ignominious and miserable than death, being spoyled of all, *domos circumuendo, foresq; appulsando cibum dari sibi suppliciter precabantur; from doore to doore in most abject and beggerly manner praying for some reliefe of the proud and insolent victor*: nor was *Totilas* content herewith, but he was resolved <sup>o</sup> to ruinate and utterly deface the whole city of Rome, which also he had then done, had not the most prudent perswasions <sup>p</sup> of *Bellifarius* never sufficiently even for this one. ly cause to bee commended, hindred so barbarous a designe. And which is noted as one of the most miserable spectacles of all other, in Rome which was the most frequent, populous, and eminent City in the whole world, *Totilas* when he went away left not so much as one man <sup>q</sup>, woman, or childe to remaine or inhabit therein; would any but *Anastasius* call or account this fatherly usage? what is then, or can

f Annus 14. exibat basius belii, Totilas deinde copias Romanas duclavit, &c. Proc. l. 3. pa. 394. g Præcepit ut quanta vi possent buccinâ clangorē eliderent, &c. Proc. ibid. pa. 394. h Et facta est fama in civitate talis, &c. Anast. in vita Vigily. i Vt testatur Proc. l. 3. p. 367. k Vbi primum illuxit Golbi, &c. Proc. pa. 373. l Pelagius Totile supplex factus, non prius precari hunc desistit, quam ille clementiorem fore in Romanos pollicitus esset. Proc. lib. 3. pa. 374. m Pars maxima fugam cepissent, pauci in templo persequium habuere, constat de plebe ad quingentos in urbe residere. Proc. ibid. pa. 375. n Inter hos erat Rusticana filia Symmachi, et uxor Boetij Senatoris. Proc. ib. o Totilas Romam ad solam prosperare decernit. Proc. pa. 375. p E duobus (sic ad eum scripsit Bellifarius) alterum necesse est ut aut bello victus succumbas, aut ut nos vincas. Si viceris, et Romam demoliaris, non alterius urbem sed tuam delibis, quâ servata,

longe opulentior fiet. Si virtus sis, Româ incolumi reservata, gratia tibi nec mediocri apud victorem conciliabitur, qua deleta nullus tibi ad clementiam locus relinquitur. His (inter similes alias) perswasionibus usus est Bellifarius apud Totilam, ut refert Proc. lib. 3. pa. 375.

q Nullo hominum in urbe relicto, quam penitus desolatam demiserat. Proc. lib. eod. p. 375. Roma fuit ita desolata ut nemo ibi hominum, nisi bestia morarentur. Marcell. in Chron. an. 547.

be called hostile, savage, and barbarous? But let us leave this passage; wherein we will account no more than ten of *Anastasius* grand lyes, and proceed to the rest of his narration.

23. *At the same time, saith he, the Emperour sent Narses into Italie, to whom God gave the victory over the Gothes, the King and a great multitude of them were slaine.* I should have thought this *codem tempore* to have had relation (as in an orderly narration it ought) to that taking of *Rome* by *Totilas*, which is before expressed; which if *Anastasius* meant, then is this circumstance most surable to all the rest, that is, wholly untrue: for *Totilas* the first time tooke *Rome* in the 12. and the second time in the 15. yeare of the Gothicke warre, whereas *Narses* overcame him not, nor came as chiefe Generall into *Italy* till the eighteenth yeare of the same warre. All which by *Procopius* is clearly testified. But *Binius* doth here set to his helping hand, and making a glosse upon the text, by two notes of time he declareth unto what this *Anastasian codem tempore* is to be referred: the former is this: It was, saith he<sup>r</sup>, *Illo anno quo Imperator revocavit Edictum*; in that yeare where, in the Emperour at the instance of Pope *Vigilius* recalled the Edict, which he had published concerning the three Chapters, shewing himselfe therein obedient to the Pope; in that yeare *Narses* the Captaine of the *Romane* armie, trusting to the helpe of God, by the intercession of the blessed *Virgin Mary*, put to flight and killed *Totilas*, with his whole army. So *Binius*: upon whose glosse it will inevitably follow that *Narses* never overcame *Totilas*, nor was sent Generall into *Italie*. For it is certaine, (as before wee have by many reasons proved) and by the testimony of the whole generall Councell, that *Iustinian* did not at all recall that Edict: he was both before and after the Councell, yea after the death of *Vigilius*, earnest in the defence thereof. But let us admit that hee had indeed recalled that Edict, when thinke you was this done? No man can tell you better than *Baronius*, who referres all that to the 26. yeare of *Iustinian*, which is the 17. of the Gothicke warre; for by his narration, not onely the Emperour in that yeare revoked his Edict against the *Three Chapters*, but he with *Theodorus* Bishop of *Casarea*, and *Mennas*, were all in that yeare reconciled to the Pope, and a perfect peace concluded on all hands before the moneth of *July*; peace being concluded *Mennas* shortly after dyed. If then as *Binius* glosseth, *Totilas* was slaine *eo anno*, in that yeare wherein *Iustinian* is supposed to have recalled his Edict, then was he certainly vanquished and slaine, not by *Narses*, for he as *Procopius* sheweth, came not as chiefe Generall into *Italy*, untill the 18. yeare of the Gothicke warre, which is the 27. of *Iustinian*. Againe, seeing it followeth in *Anastasius*, *Tunc adunatus*, then when *Totilas* was vanquished and killed, did the *Romane* Clergie entreat to have *Vigilius* with the rest restored from exile. It hence clearly followeth, that *Anastasius* can meane no other exile, than such as was inflicted upon him some three or foure yeares before, for the cause of *Anthimus*, and not that which followed the Councell: for the Councell was not held in the seventeenth yeare of the Gothicke warre, or six and twentieth of *Iustinian*, but in the eighteenth of the one, and seven and twentieth of the other, as the Acts doe witnesse:

or

<sup>r</sup> De Roma cap. 22, supra ostendimus. De Narsese liquet, ex Proc. lib. 3. p. 408. ubi ait Iam 17. huius belli exibat annus. Et paulo post, Narses ex Saloniis (in Sicilia) profectus adversus Totilam progreditur. Ibid.  
<sup>f</sup> Bin. Not. in vitam Vigily. §. Eodem.  
<sup>r</sup> Iustinianus omnia semper fecit, & facit, que sanctam Ecclesiam & vestra dogmata conservant. Conc. 5. Coll. 7. in fine.  
<sup>u</sup> Bar. an. 55. nu. 15. 22. 23.

<sup>z</sup> Proc. lib. 3. p. 408.

or if *Baronius* will needs have the exile following the Councell, to be that from which *Narses* entreated that he might be delivered; then it certainly followeth upon this account of *Binius*, reckoning *Totilas* death to be in the six and twentieth of *Iustinian*, that *Narses* and the Romane Clergy entreated the Emperour to restore *Vigilius* out of exile, before he was cast into exile; nay before the Councell was assembled, or before *Vigilius* had given any cause why he should be banished; which doth not well accord with the wisdom of *Narses* and the Romane Clergy to entreat, nor was it possible for the Emperour to grant. The same is further manifest by the other note of time which *Binius*\* sets down, that *Totilas* was killed *decimo anno regni sui*, in the 10 year of his reigne, as the holy Monk *Bennet* had foretold unto him: for *Totilas* was made King of the Goths in the 7. yeare of the Gothick war, as *Procopius*† testifieth, which was in the 16. yeare of *Iustinian*, and as it seemeth by his Acts, in the beginning of the yeare. But to helpe the Benedictine prophesie, we will suppose him to be made in the last end of all, and account the next yeare for his first: yet even so must *Totilas* be vanquished and slaine before the beginning of the 18. yeare of the Gothicke war, or 27. of *Iustinian*, for with the end of the 17. yeare of the Gothicke warre is fully completed the tenth yeare of *Totilas*. Wherefore if *Benedict* was not a lying Prophet, and if *Totilas* was slaine *decimo anno*, in his tenth yeare, then all the former inconveniences doe upon this account also ensue; that he was not vanquished by *Narses*; that then, when he was slain, *Narses* & the Romane Clergy did not entreat for the delivery of *Vigilius* out of banishment, and the like; seeing it is certaine that *Narses* came not into *Italie*, and that *Vigilius* was not banished (by that Baronian exile which followeth the Councell) till the 18. yeare of the Gothicke war, and 27. of *Iustinian*. Or if any to excuse *Binius* will expound as *Baronius*‡ doth, the prophesie to be meant that *Totilas* was slaine *anno decimo*, that is, in the tenth yeare being complete, that plainly contradicteth the prophesie: for if the tenth yeare was wholly ended, then was he not slaine in the tenth, but onely in the eleventh yeare, nor in the tenth otherwise than in the first, second, or sixth yeare; nay slaine in the yeare before hee was borne, that is, slaine after all those yeares ended and fully completed.

24. Now that which *Binius*\* interlaceth of the Emperours being so obsequent and obedient to the Pope; or as *Baronius*† expresseth it, for being ruled by the Popes command, these as being but flourishes of their vanity and arrogancy, I will passe over. The Acts both of *Iustinian*, and of the fifth Councell doe demonstrate that *Iustinian* was (as he ought to be) the commander of the Pope, the Popes Empire was not as yet in the cradle. But that which is added, that *Narses* overcame the Gothes by the intercession of the blessed Virgin, I am desirous a little more at large to examine, the rather, because *Baronius*‡ little lesse than triumpheth therein. *Narses*, saith he, *indeavored all these things, Maria virginis ope, by the help of the virgin Mary*. And again, having cited certain words out of *Evagrius* to prove it, By this, saith<sup>d</sup> he, you do understand, *cujus nisi presidio duces debeant, on whose help Generals & Captains must rely*, that they may perform every difficult enterprife;

\* Bin not. cit.

y Hujus belli annus sextus exierat. Proc. lib. 3 pa. 346. &amp; Totilas ex conventu suscepit imperium. idem pa. 347.

z Necatur Totilas, anno undecimo regni sui incabato, decimo expleto. Bar. an. 553. nu. 16.

a Se Rom. Pontifici obsequentem praebeat. Bin. loc. citat. et iidem Bar. an. 553. nu. 16. b Dum sibi imperari a Rom. Pontifice passus est. Bar. ibid. nu. 17. c Bar. an. 553. nu. 15.

d Ibid. nu. 16.



truely even on the helpe of *Mary* the Mother of God, who being invocated by our prayers may rise against the enemy, for of her the Church singeth, *Terribilis ut Castrorum acies*, thou art terrible as an army well ordered. Thus the Cardinall, wresting and abusing the Scripture, to draw mens confidence from the Lord of Hosts to the blessed Virgin, making her, contrary to her sexe, to be another *Mars*, and a chiefe warriar in all the greatest battels of the Christians. But for the truth of the matter, what *Narses* did, *Procopius* doth declare, who thus writeth of him; When *Tatilas* was overcome, *Narses* being exceeding joyfull, *id est* Deo acceptū ut erat in vero indefinenter referre, did continually attribute all that victorie to God, so whom in truth it was to be ascribed. *Evagrius* the Cardinals own witnesse, testifieth the same, even in that place which the Cardinall alledgeth, his words are these, *quod dicitur*, they who were with *Narses* report, that, *dum precibus divinum numen placeret*, while he appeased or pleased God by his prayer, & other offices of piety, and gave due honour unto him, the Virgin, Mother of God, appeared unto him, and plainly set downe the time when he should fight with the enemies, nor fight w<sup>th</sup> the, til he received a sign from above. Thus *Evag.* in whose words three things are to be observed: First, that *Narses* used no in vocatiō or prayer to the blessed Virgin, or any other, but only to God, it was *Divinū numen*, the very Godhead, which hee did in his prayers, & offices of piety adore. Secondly, that *Evag.* mentioneth not either invocation, or adoration, used by *Narses* to the Virgin, or any confidence that hee reposed in her, or that she at al helped him in the battle, but only that she appeared unto him as a messenger, to signifie what time he should fight. Now as the Angel *Gabriel* was no helper to the Virgin *Mary*, either in the cōception of Christ, or in his birth, though, as a messenger from God, hee signifieth them both unto *Ioseph*, (*Ioseph* neither invoking him nor relying on him, but on God, whose messenger he was) even so, admitting the truth of this apparitiō, the Virgin *Mary* did signifie from God the time when *Narses* should fight, but neither did *Narses* invoke or adore her, nor did shee her selfe more helpe in the battle than the Angell in the birth of Christ; nor did the confidence of *Narses* relie on her, but on God, whose messenger he then beleevved her to be. Let the Cardinall, or *Binus*, or any of them prove forcibly (which they can never doe) out of *Evagrius* any other invocation or adoration used by *Narses* to the blessed Virgin, and I will consent unto them in that whole point. Thirdly, all that *Evagrius* saith of that apparitiō of the blessed Virgin, is but a rumour and report of some who were with *Narses*: *quod dicitur*, some say, *Evagrius* himselfe doth not say it was so, or that *Narses* either said or beleevved it to be so, but reported it was by some of the souldiers of *Narses*, whether true or false, that must relie on the credit of the reporters. Now for the Cardinall to avouch a doctrine of faith out of a rumour or report of how credible men themselves knew not, from such an uncertainty to collect, that Generals ought to relie on the aide of the blessed Virgin in their battels, and that shee, *interpellata precibus*, being invocated by their prayers, riseth up, and becomes a warriar on their side; this, by none that are indifferent can be judged lesse than exceeding temerity;

Proc. lib. 3. pa.  
416.

Evag. lib. 4. ca.  
33.

ty, and by those that are religious will bee condemned as plaine superstition and impiety. But let us returne now to *Anastasius*, whose narration, as it is untrue in it selfe, if the comming of *Narses* into Italy, and victory over the *Goths*, bee referred to that time; when *Totilas* had before wonne *Rome*, so it is much more untrue, if it bee referred, as by *Binius* glosse it is, either to the yeare wherein the Emperour recalled his Edict, (which was never) or to the tenth yeare of *Totilas*, which was wholly ended before the comming of *Narses* into Italy, and before the fift Councell, and the Baronian banishment of *Vigilius*.

25. After the victory of *Narses* it followeth in *Anastasius*, tunc adunatus Clerus, then the *Roman* Clergy joyned together, besought *Narses* that hee would intreat the Emperour, that if as yet *Pope Vigilius*, with the Presbiters and Deacons that were carried into banishment with him, were alive, they might returne home. In that they speake of this exile, as long before begun, even so long that they doubted whether *Vigilius* were then alive or no; it seemeth evidently, that *Anastasius* still hath an eye to that banishment for the cause of *Anthimus*, after he had beene two yeares in *Constantinople*; that falling five & whole yeares before the victory of *Narses*, they had reason to adde, si adhuc, if *Vigilius* doe live as yet, that is, after so long time of banishment, remaine alive. Now seeing it is certaine, that *Vigilius* was not at that time (to wit, not within two yeares after his comming to *Constantinople*) banished, as by the fift generall Councell is evident, it hence followeth, that as this *Anastasian* exile, so all the consequents depending thereon are nothing else but a meere fiction of *Anastasius*, without all truth or probability: for seeing *Vigilius* was not then banished, neither did the *Romanes* intreat *Narses*, nor *Narses* the Emperour for his delivery, nor the Emperour upon that send to recall him or them from exile, nor use any such words about *Pelagius*, nor thanke them if they would accept *Vigilius*, nor did they promise after the death of *Vigilius* to chuse *Pelagius*, nor did the Emperour dismisse them all (for of *Pelagius* that hee three yeares after the end of the Councell remained in banishment, is certainly testified by *Victor*) nor did they returne from exile into *Sicilie*; all this is a meere fiction. So in this Catastrophe, beginning at the time when *Anastasius* saith *Totilas* was King of the *Goths*, there are contained at least forty capitall untruths, to let passe the rest, as being of lesser note and moment. Let any now cast up the whole summe; I doubt not but hee shall finde, not onely, as I have said, so many untruths as there are lines, but (if one would strictly examine the matter) as there are words in the *Anastasian* description of the life of *Vigilius*; & I am verily perswaded, that few Popes lives scape better at his hands than this: But I have staid long enough in declaring the falshood of *Anastasius*, on whom *Baronius* so much relyeth, and who is a very fit author for such an Annalist as *Baronius*.

g Nam Vigilius venit Constanti-  
nopolim anno 12  
belli Gothici.  
Proc. lib. 3. pa.  
364. Narses au-  
tem Totilam vi-  
cit, et Romanum  
recepit an. 18.  
eiusdem belli.  
Proc. lib. 3. pa.  
408. et seq.  
h Nam ex eo li-  
quet, Vigilium  
a primo ejus ad-  
ventu Constanti-  
nopolim, illic  
mansisse ad finē  
Concilij, dicitur  
enim illic à Tu-  
stiniano, quod  
Vigilius semper  
eiusdem volun-  
tatis fuit de con-  
demnatione Tri-  
um Capitulo-  
rum. Conc. 5.  
Coll. 1. pa. 520. a  
Semper, viz. a  
primo ejus advē-  
tu et consensu  
ad tempus 5.  
Concilij.  
i Nam Victor  
ait Pelagium re-  
disse ab exilio  
anno 18. post  
cess. Basilij.  
Vist. T. 1. in  
Chron. et Concl.  
lium habitum  
ait ille an. 13.  
post ejusdem  
Consulatum;

## CAP. XXXVI.

That Baronius reproveth Pope Vigilius for his comming to Constantinople, and a refutation thereof; with a description of the life of the same Vigilius.



After all which the Cardinall could devise to disgrace either the Emperor or the Empresse, or Theodorus Bishop of Cesarea, or the cause it selfe of the *Three Chapters*, or the Synodall Acts; in the last place let us consider what he saith against Pope *Vigilius*; for, this cause setled him, that whatsoever or whosoever came in his way, though it were his Holinesse himselfe, hee would not spare them, if he thought thereby to gaine never so little for the support of their infallible Chaire: And what think you is it that he carps at, and for which hee so unmannerly quarrels Pope *Vigilius*? was it for oppugning the truth published by the Emp. Edict, or was it for making his hereticall *Constitution*, and defining it *ex Cathedra*, in defence of the *Three Chapters*? or was it for his peevishnesse in refusing to come to the generall Councell, even then when he was present in the City where it was held, and had promised under his owne hand that hee would come unto it? or was it his pertinacious obstinacy in heresie, that he would rather undergoe both the just sentence of an *anathema* denounced by the generall Councell, and also the calamity and wearinesse of exile inflicted by the Emperor (as *Baronius* saith) upon him, then yeelding to the truth and true judgement of the Synod in condemning the *Three Chapters*? Are these (which are all of them hainous crimes, and notorious in *Vigilius*) the matters that offend the Cardinall? No, none of these, hee is not used to finde such faults in their Popes, these all hee commends as rare vertues, as demonstrations of constancy, of prudence, of fortitude in *Vigilius*? what then is it that his Cardinalship dislikes? Truly, among many great and eminent vices in *Vigilius*, which are obvious, and runne into every mans sight, it hapned that once in his life he did one thing worthy of commendations, and that was his obedience in going to Constantinople, when the Emperour<sup>a</sup> called and requested<sup>b</sup> him to come thither, and the Cardinall winking at all the other, reproves his Holinesse for this one thing, which both in equity and duty hee ought to have done: This forsooth is it which hee notes as a very<sup>c</sup> dangerous and hurtfull matter, and a speciall point of great indiscretion in Pope *Vigilius*, that leaving *Rome*, that holy City, hee would goe to Constantinople, and to the Emperours Court, which his predecessors, *Leo* and others, in very great wisdom would never do, nor goe into the East, nor suffer themselves to bee pulled away from their See fixed at *Rome*.

2. Truly, I never knew before that there was such vertue in the *Romane*, or such venome in the Constantinopolitane soile, or in the Easterne

<sup>a</sup> Vigilius ab Imperatore evocatus, Bizantium venit Proc. lib. 3 pa. 364.  
<sup>b</sup> Ipsum summâ celeritate venire rogans. Bar. an. 546. m. 54.  
<sup>c</sup> Ceterum Vigiliij profectiorem Constantinopolim, magnum intulisse Catholicæ Ecclesiæ damnum, eventa declarant, quæ et significarunt quam prudentissimè egerunt illius predecessores, S. Leo, et alij, qui vocati sæpe ab orthodoxis, licet Imperatoribus nunquam passi sunt se ab ipsâ fixâ Romæ sede divelli, &c. Bar. an. 546. m. 55. i.



Easterne ayre, specially seeing the holy Land and the holy City, and the holy Temple were all in the East: All the Westerne nations are beholding to the Cardinall for this conceit; *Shall there not bee given to thy servant two Mules load of this Romish earth?* But let us a little more fully see why the Pope, and particularly *Vigilius* might not goe to *Constantinople*. Oh; saith the Cardinall<sup>d</sup>, it is found by experience; that the Popes going from *Rome* to the Court, *obfuisse hand modicum*, hath done great hurt to the Church; for then partly by the threats; and partly by the favours and faire intreatics of Empetours, as it were with two contrary windes, the ship of *Peter* is exposed to great hazzard. *Modica fidei*, phy, a Cardinall to feare or distrust any wracke of *Saint Peters* ship, though never so dangerous a tempest happen, though, *Vna Eurvsque, Natusque ruant, creberque processis Africus*. *S. Peter* hath left such a Pilot in his *Rome*, that a thousand times sooner might he himselfe, than his ship sinke, *Pasce oves, tu es Petra, & oravi pro te* *Petre*, will uphold it against all winde and weather; And truly I would gladly know of his Cardinallship for my learning; how any of their Popes can forsake their See or *Rome*. They have heretofore held it for a maxime; *ubi Papa, ibi Roma*, let the Pope goe to *Peru*; yea, *ultra Garamantas & Indos*, he hath a priviledge above all creatures but the *Snake*; hee carrieth not onely their infallible Chaire, but the whole City of *Rome* on his backe, whithersoever hee goes. If not so, or if the Chaire bee fixt to *Rome*, where sate all their Popes for those seventy yeares<sup>f</sup>; when they were at *Avinion*? or how shall they sit in the Chaire, when their Babylonish *Rome* for her Idolatries shal be burnt with unquencheable fire, and sinke like a Millstone into the bottome of the Sea? which being foretold by *Saint Iohn*, of the *Romane* City, which yet remaineth, as their owne Iesuite *Ribera* & doth truly and undeniably demonstrate, is a most certaine Article of the Catholike faith, though they seldome thinke of it, and will hardly put it into their Creed. When their Pope (goe whither hee will) carrieth still with him his infallible Chaire, was it not infidelity in the Cardinall to dreame or doubt lest that ship should any where miscarry, more at the Court or Kings Pallace than in a Country Cottage; more in the Trullane than in the Laterane Temple?

3. Yea, but *usurum reperitur*<sup>h</sup>, experience teacheth, that their going to the Emperour hath done exceeding hurt; and particularly for *Vigilius*, that his going to *Constantinople* hath brought<sup>i</sup>; *magnum damnum*, great harme to the Catholike Church, *deklarant eventa*, the events have shewed. Events and experience are the most woefull arguments in Divinitie, that can possibly be devised. Measure the Gospel by temporall calamities which ensued upon it, the bloody murdering of the Apostles, of the Saints of God, almost for three hundred yeares together, and hee may as well conclude, that the Gospel and truth of Christ is found by woefull experience to have brought exceeding great hurt to the Church. The Cardinall was driven to a narrow strait, and an exceeding penury of reasons; when he was forced to put, *Argumentum ab eventu*, for one of his Topical places.

2 King. 5. 17.

d Bar. loc. cit.

e Sententia illa  
omnium ore ver-  
sata, Vbi Papa,  
ibi Roma, Bar.  
an. 552. nu. 10.

f Clemens 5.  
propter seditiones  
italicas sedem  
Pontificiam ab  
urbe Roma,  
Avinionem Gal-  
lie urbem, ubi  
successores suos  
severamus  
90. transtulla.  
Genab. in Chron.  
in an. 1305.

g Iohannes in  
omnibus que de  
Babylone loqui-  
tur, adversus ur-  
bem Romanam  
vaticinatur, &c.  
Rid. com. in ca.  
14. Apoc. nu. 17.  
et V. beatus  
Christi abicant  
st. et Episcopus  
Romae, etiam  
illa postius ex-  
cisa sit. Ibid. nu.  
48.

h Obfuisse hand  
modicum usu re-  
rum reperitur,  
Pontificiam ab  
urbe profectio ad  
Comitatum. Bar.  
an. 546. nu. 33.  
i Ibid.

4. But say, what hurt can he tell us that ever any Emperours presence with the Pope, brought unto the Church? If both were Catholike, or both hereticall, they agreed well enough together. As nor Satans, so much lesse is Gods Kingdome devided against it selfe; if the Emperour Catholike, and the Pope hereticall, the worst the Emperour ever did, was but to inflit just punishment on an heretike, the worst the Pope sustained was but a just recompence of his heresie and hatred of truth: The execution of Iustice never did, nor ever can hurt the Catholike Church. If the Emperour were hereticall and the Pope orthodoxall, there was trial of the Popes art & skil in converting such a man to the truth; triall of his constancy and love unto Gods truth, whether by feare or favour he would forsake it: triall of his patience and fortitude in ipduring all torments, even death it selfe, for his love to Christ. All the hurt which such an Emperour did, or could doe, was to crowne him a glorious Martyr, and in stead of the white garment of innoeency, to send him in scarlet robes unto heaven; and wee be to that Church which shall thinke Martyrdome an hurt unto it, which was, and ever will bee the glory of the Catholike Church. *Non decet sub spinoso capite membrum esse delicatum*, when Christ, his Apostles, and glorious Saints, and Martyrs, have gone before upon thornes and briars, wee must not looke to have a silken way, strewed with Roses and Lillies, unto the Kingdome of God. This, which is yet the very worst that can befall any Catholike, is no harme to him who hath learned that lesse, *Blessed are they which die in the Lord*; so whether Pope and Emperour be both of one, or of a different religion, his presence with the Emperour may happen to doe good, but it is certaine it can never possibly doe hurt unto the Church. The greatest hurt that was ever done to the Church by this meanes, was when *Constantine* after his baptisme by Pope *Silvester*, in lieu of his paines, and in token of a thankful minde, sealed unto him that donation<sup>k</sup> of the *Romane* and *Westerne Provinces*: That one fable I must particularly except, for by it hath beene lift up the man of sinne, *Christian Empires* have beene robbed, the ignorant seduced, the whole Church abused: *Nero* did not the thousand parts so much hurt by martyring *Peter* and *Paul* when they were present with him, as the most falsly supposed donation hath done to the Catholike Church.

Recu. 14. 13.

<sup>k</sup> Donationis exemplar extat  
Dis. 96. ca. Constantinus.

<sup>l</sup> Agapetus Barberico coactus  
Imperio, &c.  
Bar. an. 536. nu.  
10. qui Agapeti  
profectionem eo  
anno comigisse  
probat.

5. Will you yet see the great vanity of the Cardinall in this reason drawne from the event, and the Emperours presence. Some<sup>l</sup> ten yeares before this, Pope *Agapetus*, being sent by *Theodosius* King of the *Gothes*, came to *Constantinople*, and to the same Emperour: It so fell out, that at that time *Anthimus* an heretike and an intruder, held the Sea of *Constantinople*: *Agapetus* deposed him, that is, hee declared and denounced (which was true indeed) that hee was never lawfully Bishop of that See, and that himselfe did not, nor ought others to hold him for the lawfull Bishop thereof; whereupon *Mennas* was chosen and consecrated Bishop by *Agapetus* in *Anthimus* his roome. *Vigilius* was called by the Emperour, *Agapetus* sent by a *Gothish* usurper, *Vigilius* called by a religious and most orthodoxall Professor, *Agapetus* sent by an heretike and *Arian* King; *Vigilius* called purpose-ly

ly about causes of faith, *Agapetus* sent only about civil, and but casually intermeddling with Ecclesiasticall causes. You would now even blesse your selfe to see how the Card. here turns this argument *ab eventu*, & by it proves the Popes presence at the same Court with the same Emperour, to have brought such an infinite & unspeakable good unto the Church, as could scarce bee wished. *Agapetus* no longer sent from *Theodosius* a barbarous Goth, but even from God himselfe, and by him commanded to goe thither with an errand from heaven; hee seemed to bee sent to intreat of peace, but hee was commanded by God to goe, *ut imperaret imperantibus*, that he should shew himselfe to be an Emperour above the Emperour: He, like Saint *Peter*, had not gold nor silver being faine to pawne the holy Vessels for to furnish him with money in the journey, but he was rich in the power and heavenly treasures of working miracles. Now was demonstrated the highest power of the Pope, that without any Councell called about the matter, as the custome is, hee could depose a Patriarke, (at other times hee may not have that title) and a Patriark of so high a See as *Constantinople*, and so highly favoured by the Emp. & Empreffe. Now was demonstrated, that, *Pontifex supra omnes Canones eminet*, that the Popes power is above all Canons, for hereby was shewed, that he by his omnipotent authority may do matters with the Canons, without the Canons, against all Canons; & seeing his judgement was without a Synod, (which in a Patriarks cause is required) *fuit secundum supremam Apostolica sedis auctoritatem*, it was according to his supreme authority, which is transcendent above all Canons; or to use *Bellarmines* phrase, hee did shew himselfe to bee, *Princeps Ecclesie*, one that may doe against the whole Church. Nay, if you well consider, *admirari non desines*, you will never cease to wonder, to see that *Agapetus* a poore man, as soone as hee came to *Constantinople* should *imperare Imperatoribus*, *eorum facta rescindere*, *jura dare*, *omnibusq; jubere*, so command Emperours, to adnull their Acts, to depose a Patriarke and thrust him from his throne, to set another there, so set downe lawes, and command all men, and to do all this without any Synod: & such a Pope was *Agapetus*, that I know not, *an similis alius inveniri possit*, whether such another can bee found among them all. Thus declameth *Baronius*. Where thinke you, all time was the Cardinals argument *ab adventu*? Experience teacheth, that when Popes leave their See, and goe to the Court or Emperours presence, the ship of *S. Peter* is then in great hazzard: If *Agapetus* his comming to *Constantinople* or to the Emperour did not hazzard or endanger the Church, how came it to bee perillous a few yeares after in *Vigilius*? and where were now the most wise examples of Pope *Leo* and the other, who in great wisdom could never be drawne to the East, and from their owne See? how was the holy Church now fixed to *Rome*, when *Agapetus* had it in the greatest majesty and honour at *Constantinople*? perceive you not how these arguments lie asleepe in the cause of *Agapetus*, which the Cardinall rouseth up when *Vigilius* goes to *Constantinople*? This, *ab adventu*, as all the Cardinals Topicke places, is drawne from the art and authority of *Esope*s Satyr: If they make for the Pope, as the event did in *Agapetus*, then the Cardinall with his Satyrs blast will puffe them up and make them

in *Agapetus* licet à Rege visus sit missus ad Imperatorem, à Deo tamen proficisci missus apparuit, ut imperaret imperantibus, &c. Bar. an. 536. nu. 12.

n illud ipsum sermo contigit *Agapetus*, quod olim *Petro*, &c. *Ibid.* nu. 13. o in his omnibus peragendis summa potestas Apostolica sedis Antistitis demonstrata est, &c. *Ibid.* nu. 22. p *Ibid.* nu. 23.

q Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 18. Pontifex et Princeps Ecclesie sumus, potest retrahere judicium Concilij, et non sequi majorem partem. r Bar. an. 536. nu. 31. t *Ibid.* nu. 70.



them swell to demonstrations: But if they make against the Pope, as did the event in *Vigilius*, all arguments in the world drawne from the cause, effect, or any other Topickall or demonstrative place, the Cardinall with a contrary breath can turne them al to Sophistications. He is another *Iannes* or *Iambres* of this age, when any argument or Topick place is for the Romish *Pharao*, it shall sting like a Serpent, when it is used against King *Pharao* it shall bee as dull and dead as a stick.

6. And yet what are those ill events and dangers whereunto the Church was brought by the comming of *Vigilius* to *Constantinople*? what hurt received it by the presence of the Pope with *Iustinian*? Sure the Cardinall in good discretion should have expressed them, at least some one of them, but hee was too politike to open such secrets of their State; for mine owne part I cannot, but first condemne his foule ingratitude in this point. *Vigilius* before hee came to *Constantinople*, was earnest in oppugning the truth, and Catholike faith, by defending of the *Three Chapters*, hee defended them by words, by writings, by censures, by the utmost of his power: All the hurt the Emperour did him was this, that he converted him to the truth, that hee brought him to define, by an *Apostolicall Constitution*, that truth which before hee oppugned; and in this tune the Emperour kept him for five or sixe yeares together, but then when his old fit of heresie came upon him againe, when at the time of the generall Councell he forlook the Emperours holy faith, his communion, and, as may bee thought, even his company and presence also, by this absence from the Emperour, he relapsed quite from the Catholike faith, even from that which before hee had defended and defined, so long as hee kept society with the Emperour. When the Emperours presence made hereticall Pope *Vigilius* for the space of five or sixe yeares a Catholike Pope, (at least in shew and profession) doe you not thinke *Baronius* to deale unkindly with the Emperour in blaming the time that ever *Vigilius* came to the Emperour, that is in effect to blame, and little lesse than curse the day wherein *Vigilius* renounced heresie, and embraced or made profession of the Catholike faith.

7. Now as this good redounded to *Vigilius* in particular by his comming to *Constantinople*, so there is another and publike benefit which ensued thence to the whole Church, and that so great and so happy, that if we should (as the Cardinall doth) measure things by the event, the comming of *Agapetus* to *Constantinople*, though they glory therein more than in any other example of antiquity, is no way comparable to this of *Vigilius*, for by this comming of *Vigilius* it was demonstrated by evident experience, that the Pope may say and gainsay his owne sayings in matters of faith, and then define *ex Cathedra*, both his sayings, that is, two direct contradictories to be both true, seeing Pope *Vigilius*, first, while hee temporized with the Emperour defined *ex Cathedra*, that the *Three Chapters* ought to bee condemned, and after that, when it pleased him to open the depth of his owne heart, defined the quite contrary *ex Cathedra*, that the *Three Chapters* ought to bee defended. By it was further demonstrated, that the Pope may not onely be an heretike, but teach also and define

fine, and that *ex cathedra*, an heresie to be truth, and so be a convicted, condemned, and anathematized heretike, by the judgment of an holy generall Councell, and of the whole Catholike Church. These and some other like conclusions of great moment for the instruction of the whole Church of God, are so fully, so clearly, so undenyably demonstrated in the cause of Pope *Vigilius*, when he came to *Constantinople*, that had the Cardinall or his favourers (I meane the maintainers of the Popes infallibility,) grace to make use thereof for the opening of their eyes in that maine and fundamentall point, wherein they are now so miserably blinded, they might have greater cause to thank God for his comming thither, than for the voyage of *Agapetus*, or of any other of his predecessors undertaken in many yeares before.

8. Where are now the great hurts and inconveniences which the Cardinall fancieth by *Vigilius* his comming to the Emperour? Truly I cannot devise, what one they can finde, but the disgrace onely of *Vigilius*, in that upon his comming he shewed himselfe to be a temporizer, a very weather-cocke in faith, a dissembler with God and his Church, pretending for five or six yeares that hee favoured the truth; when all that time he harboured in his brest the deadly poyson of that heresie, which as before his comming he defended, so at the time of the Councell he defined. This blot or blemish of their holy Father, neither I, nor themselves, with all the water in Tiber, can wash or ever wipe away. The best use that can be made of it, is, that as *Thomas* distrusted, to make others faithfull and void of distrust; so God, in the infinitenesse of his wisdom, permitted Pope *Vigilius* to be not only unconstant, but hereticall in defining causes of faith, that others by relying on the Popes judgement as infallible, might not be hereticall: and yet even for this very fact, thus much I must needs say, that if the Cardinall thinke it was the place, or the City of *Constantinople*, that wrought this disgracefull effect in *Vigilius*, it may bee truly replied unto him much like as *Themistocles* did to the foolish *Seriphian*, ascribing his owne ignobility to the baseness of the towne of *Seriphus*, certainly though *Silvester*, *Iulius*, and *Celestine* had bene never so oft at *Constantinople*, they had bene orthodoxall and heroicall Bishops; but *Vigilius* hereticall and ignoble, though he had bene nayled to the posts of the Vaticane, or chained to the pillars of it as fast as *Prometheus* to *Caucasus*. The soyle and ayre is as Catholike at *Constantinople*, as in the very Laterane; it is as hereticall in Rome, as in any City in all the world. The onely difference is in the men themselves, the former, where ever they had come, caried with them constant, heroicall, and truly pontificall minds; *Vigilius* in every place was of an ambitious, unstable, dissembling, hypocriticall, and hereticall spirit: which that every one may perceive, I will now in the last place, and in stead of an Epilogue to this whole Treatise, set downe a true description of the life of *Vigilius*: partly because it may bee thought a great wrong to reject the narration of *Anastasius*, and not some way to supply that defect, touching the life of so memorable a Pope as was *Vigilius*; partly with a true report of this hereticall Popes life, to requite the labour of *Baronius*, in his malicious slanders of the religious

Empe:

2 Cic. lib. de  
Senect.

u De quo Otho  
Imperator di-  
xit postquam se-  
disset 8. annos,  
Puer est: erat  
enim cum inva-  
sit sedem non nisi  
annorum 18.  
Bar. an. 953. nu.  
1. & 2. Cujus  
electioni lex mul-  
ta suffragata est,  
sed vis & metus  
omnia impleve-  
runt. ibid. n. 3.  
x De quo dicitur,  
Intravit ut vul-  
per, regnavit ut  
leo, mortuus est ut  
canis. Geneb. in  
suo Chron. ad an.  
1303.  
y Pontificatum  
adjuvantis dia-  
boli consequen-  
tus est, hac ta-  
men lege, ut post  
mortem totius  
illius esset. Plat.  
in Silo. 2.  
z Johannes in-  
ter Christi fide-  
les, vitam &  
morem ejus cog-  
noscentes, vul-  
gariter dicitur  
Diabolus incar-  
natus. Conc.  
Constant. Sess. 11.  
pa. 1579.  
a Contra jura  
canonica, tem-  
poribus Bonifa-  
cii Papa, ipse vi-  
ventis, successor  
ejus designari  
conabaris. Epist.  
1. Silverij quæ  
est ad Vigilium.  
b Bonifacius 2.  
congregavit Sy-  
nodum, & fecit  
Constitutum ut  
sibi successorem  
nominaret, quo  
constituto, cum

Emperour *Justinian*; and specially because *Vigilius* being the subject; (in a manner) of this whole Treatise, it seemes to mee needfull to ex-  
presse the most materiall circumstances, touching the entrance, the  
actions, the end of him, who hath occasioned us to undertake this so  
long, and as I truly professe, both laborious and irk some labour.

9. I confesse I have no good faculty in writing their Popes lives,  
*Nec fonte labra prolixi Caballino, nec in bicipiti somniasse Parnasso memini*;  
I have not tasted of their streames of *Tiber*, more holy than *Helicon*,  
nor ever had I dreame or vision in their sacred *Parnassus*; yet with  
their leave will I adventure to set downe some parts of the life of *Vigi-  
lius*, which doe afford as much variety of matter, and are as needfull  
to be knowne and remembred, as any other of that whole ranke from  
*S. Peter* to *Paul* the first.

10. That many of their Popes have unjustly climbed up to *S. Peters*  
Chaire, I thinke none so unskilfull as not to know, none so malicious  
as to deny: But whether any of them all, I except none, not the boy-  
Pope *John* the 12. not the Fox *Boniface*, not *Silvester* the second,  
who had it by a compact with the Devill, of whom hee purchased it  
with the gift of his soule; not *John* the 23. called a Devill incarnate;  
nor any else; whether any of them all, I say, obtained the See with  
more impiety; or greater villany than *Vigilius*, may be justly doub-  
ted. He, intending to be a good cammock, beganne (according to  
the Proverb;) to hooke and crooke betimes, and gape after that emi-  
nent Throne. His first attempt<sup>a</sup> was in the time of *Boniface* the se-  
cond; with whom he prevailed so far, that when *Boniface*<sup>b</sup> in a Roman  
Synod had made a Constitution that he should nominate his succe-  
sor, before them all he named and constituted *Vigilius* to succeed  
to himselfe: for the performance of which, both he and all the rest of the  
Synod did binde themselves, both by subscription, and by a solemne  
oath. *Vigilius* seemed for a while to be cocke-sure of the See: but it  
fell out contrary to his expectation at this time: the Senate of Rome  
justly withstood (as Pope *Silverius*<sup>c</sup> witnesseth) that nomination. It  
may be they knew the crooked disposition of *Vigilius*, how unfit hee  
was to make a Bishop: nor the Senate onely, but the Ecclesiasticall  
Canons resisted it: Thou endeavouredst this *contra jura canonica*, saith  
Pope *Silverius*<sup>d</sup>, against the Canonically right. The Italian lawes also re-  
sisted it at that time; *Theodorick*<sup>e</sup>, and after him *Odoacer*<sup>f</sup>, having en-  
acted, and that as they affirme by the advice of Pope *Simplicius*, *electio-  
nem Romani Pontificis ad Regem spectare, that the election of the Pope should  
belong to the King*; and that no election should be made without the  
consent of the King of Italy, as by the fourth Romane Councell under  
*Symmachus* doth appeare: For which cause *Boniface* called a second Sy-  
nod to Rome, wherein he recalled<sup>g</sup> his nomination of *Vigilius*, and

chirographis Sacerdotum, et jurejurando, Diaconum Vigilium constituit. Anast. in vita Bonif. 2. c Amplissimi Senatus  
tibi obviavit iustitia. Silo. Epist. 1. d Ibid. e Electionem Rom. Pontificis ad Regem spectare Theodoricus statuerat.  
Bar. an. 531. nu. 2. f Basilius vices agens Odoacris dixit, Admonitione beatissimi Papa Simplicij, hoc nobis sub obtestatione  
meministi fuisse mandatum, ut non sine nostra consultatione, hujusmodi (Pontificis) celebraretur electio. Conc. 4. sub Symmacho.  
Et, lex una Odoacris erat, ne absque consultatione & consensu Regis Italie, electio summi Pontificis fieret. Bin. Notis in illud  
Conc. 4. g Bonifacius facta iterum Synodo reum se adiecit in confessus est quod Diaconum Vigilium constituisse, ac ip-  
sum constitutum incendio consumpsit. Anast. in vit. Bonif. 2.





p. 1. Reg. 15. 5.  
q. Liber. loc. cit. &  
misit Augustus in-  
fones suos ad Belli-  
sarium per Vigili-  
um Anas in vita  
Silvii.

r. Liber. loc. cit.  
s. Intemebat Silvius  
pro calamitatis quasi  
Gothis scripsisset ut  
Romam introirent.

Liber. loc. cit. &  
Exierunt quidam  
falsi reflex. qui di-  
xerunt, invenimus  
Silverium, &c. &  
nasit in vita Silvi-  
i. Marc. in Chron.

an. 547. Silverium  
faventem Virigi-  
i. Bellisarius submo-  
vis.

u. Obvota suspitione  
Silverium defecit  
rum ad Gothos  
transmisit in Gra-  
ciam Bellisarius,  
& Vigilius suffe-  
cit. Trac. lib. 1. de  
bell. Goth. pa. 286.

Bellisarius manda-  
vit eis ut aliam  
Papam eligerent,  
& favore Bellisarii  
ordinatus est Vigi-  
lius. Liber. loc. cit.

x. Hoc anno (548)  
expulsus est Vigi-  
lius. Bar. an. 547. nu.  
21. obijt autem Sil-  
verius a. 540. Bar.  
an. 540. nu. 2.

y. Vigilius qua  
Pontificij munera  
erat exequi mi-  
nus pratermisit.

Bar. an. 538. nu. 21  
z. Hac eadem scrip-  
simus ad beatiss.  
Papam seniori

Roma Vigilius  
sic ait Iustinianum sui  
litteris ad Mem-  
niam qua exant apud

Bar. an. 538. nu. 24  
& 77. Nam autem  
epistolam missam  
tam Memniam qua  
ad Vigilius, isto

anno 547. ex hoc  
liquet, quod ha-  
beret Concilium il-  
lud Constantinopoli-  
tanaum praece-

in quo Origines  
damatus est, nam  
Memniam admonet

Imp. ut Synodum  
de hac re habeat.  
Epist. apud Bar. n.

77. Concilium autem  
illud habitum est  
isto anno restat

Bar. an. 538. nu. 21  
& nu. 83.  
a. Bar. an. 538. nu.  
21. & 25. Legiti-  
morum Pontificum  
vestigiis insit.

b. Epist. a. Vigilius, apud Bin. pa. 482.  
c. Vigilius post ordinationem suam compellatur a Bellisario ut impleret promissionem suam Au-  
gusto, & filia redderet duo auri centenaria promissa. Vigilius autem timore Romanorum, & avaritia patrocinante nactus quosdam suos im-  
plores. Liber. loc. cit.

discouraged a faint heart: but *Vigilius* was of a better courage: though he found it not, he will make the See vacant. He comes to *Bellisarius*; *Sinite me praterire*, how gladly would I passe by this fact and fault of *Bellisarius*, one for warlike prowes, wisedome, and successe, inferiour to no Generall that *Rome* ever had, by whom the Persians were subdued, the Vandals expelled *Africke*, the Gothes out of *Italy*, the Empire restored with an overplus also to his pristine beauty and digniry! But it so fals out that all men, even the most praise-worthy, yea the most holy, *Abraham*, *Lot*, *Sampson*, *Peter*, and the rest, they all have some blemish or other, like a moale or wart in a faire body, they must all be commended as God himselfe praised *David*, with an excepti- on of that one matter of *Vriah*: *Peter* a most holy Apostle, save onely in the matter of denying Christ. *Bellisarius*, a most worthy and re- nowned man, save this one matter of *Silverius*. To this renowned *Bellisarius* comes *Vigilius*, and delivered unto him <sup>a</sup> *praeceptum Augusti*, the Empreffe mandatory letters to make him Pope; and to perswade him more easily, knowing what strong operation gold had in himselfe, *Duo ei auri centenaria promisit*; he promised to part stakes with him, and give him two hundred peeces of gold. I wish any but *Bellisarius* had beene the instrument of so vile an action. But so it was, either the command of the Empreffe, or the importunity of *Vigilius*, or both, caused him to condemne <sup>f</sup> Pope *Silverius* as guilty of treason, for practising to be- tray the Imperiall City of *Rome* to the Gothes, under pretence of which false accusation, (for I cannot assent to *Marcellinus*, who thinks *Silverius* guilty thereof) *Silverius* was expelled <sup>u</sup> and thrust away, and then *Vigilius* by the same meanes of *Bellisarius* intru- ded himselfe, and stept into the *Apostolicall* See, usurping it about two yeafes <sup>x</sup> during the life time of *Silverius*: all which time he caried himselfe <sup>y</sup> for the onely lawfull Pope; as Pope he received <sup>z</sup> Letters from *Iustinian*, as Pope he gave answer <sup>a</sup> and judgement to *Etherius*, to *Casarius* <sup>b</sup>, as true and Catholike, you may be sure, as if *S. Peter* had given them: the Chaire would not permit him to speake amisse.

12. Now though it was too bad for any Pope, to enter into the holy throne of *S. Peter*, by open injustice, by slander, and false accu- sations, by a sacrilegious extrusion of the lawfull Bishop, by Symonie, by undertaking to restore condemned heretikes, and to abolish the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, which is in effect utterly to abandon the whole Catholike faith; yet the sequell of his actions bewrayes further the most devillish minde of *Vigilius*. Who would have thought but that *Vigilius* would have kept touch, and performed his sacrilegious and symoniacall contract with the Empreffe and *Bellisarius*? *Libera- tus* <sup>c</sup> notes of him that he would doe neither, not restore *Anthimus*, ti- more *Romanorum*, it was not out of conscience, he feared the people, he feared his owne life: Not pay the 200. *Centenaria* to *Bellisarius*, avaritia patrocinante, better lose all his credit, faith, and honesty, than two hundred peeces of gold; better break his promise, than hurt his purse: But all this is nothing to his usage of Pope *Silverius*: Was it not e-

nough

nough to usurpe and violently thrust himselfe into his See, to set up *altare contra altare*, Pope against Pope, S. Peters Chaire against S. Peters Chaire, but hee must adde indignities also to the holy Bishop? Had he permitted him to live in his owne Country, in some quiet, though meane estate, it had beene some contentment to innocent *Silverius*: But *Vigilius* could not endure that, away with him, out of Rome, out of Italy, out of Europe. So by *Vigilius* meanes is *Silverius* sent to *Patara*, a City in *Licia*, once famous for the Temple and Oracle of *Apollo*: there hee is fed with the bread of tribulation, and with the water of affliction. But the rage of *Vigilius* was further incensed by two occasions, the former on *Silverius* part. He, though in exile, yet as then being the onely true and lawfull Pope, in a Councell held \* at *Patara*, by the authority of S. Peter, and the fulnesse of his Apostolicall power, thundred out from *Patara* a sentence of excommunication, of deposition, of damnation against the usurper and invader of his See, *Vigilius*. Which being an authenticke and undenyable record of the good conditions of *Vigilius*, and how fit a man he was to make a Pope, I will relate here some parts thereof. Pope *Silverius* having told *Vigilius* how he sought against law to obtaine the Papall dignity in the time of *Boniface* the second, addes this, At that time the pastorall and pontificall authority should have cut away, *execranda tua auspicia*, thy execrable beginnings, but by neglect a little wound *insanabile accrevit apostema*, is become an incurable impostume, which being senslesse of other medicines, is to be cut off with a sword. For thou art led with the audaciousnesse of the most wicked fiend, thou art franticke with ambition, thou labourst to bring the crime of error or heresie into the Apostolike See; thou followest the steps of *Simon Magus*, whose disciple thou shewest thy selfe to be, by thy workes, by giving money, by thrusting out me, and invading my See: Receive thou therefore this sentence of damnation, *sublatumq; tibi nomen, & ministerium sacerdotalis dignitatis agnosce*; and know that thou art deprived of the name, and all function of priestly ministry, being damned by the judgement of the holy Ghost, and by the Apostolike authority in us: for it is fit, *ut quod habuit amittat*, that hee should lose that which he hath received, who usurpes that which he hath not received. Thus *Silverius*: who being then the onely true Pope, pronounced this sentence of deprivation, of degradation, and damnation out of the highest authority of their Apostolike Chaire: which alone is so authentickall a testimony, of the most execrable conditions of *Vigilius*, that if I said no more, few Logicians I thinke would complaine that the description of *Vigilius* were imperfect, being so fully, so plainly, and so infallibly exprest, both by his Genus, a damnable and damned intruder, and by his foure differences, or at least properties, hereticall, schismaticall, symoniacall, Satanicall.

13. This no doubt moved the choler of *Vigilius* not a little, to heare such a thundring from *Patara*, as if *Apollo* were there set againe on his sacred trevet. But the other accident was farre worse than this. For perhaps *Vigilius* had learned that maxime which *Lewis* the French King sometime uttered, That hee who feared the Popes curse should never sleepe a quiet night. Many other Catholikes, and among them the Bishop of *Patara* grieved much to see the injury and ignominy of

e Pomp. Mel. ix  
Lib. i. in Licia.  
t Unde Patareus  
Apollo dictus.  
Vad. in Pom.  
Mel. loc. cit.

\* *Silverius* habitu illic Concilio  
Episcoporum in  
Vigilius sententiam damnationis intorquet.  
Bar. an. 538. nu.  
18. & *Vigilio* veniente Pataram venerabilis  
Episcopus, &c.  
Liber. loco cit.  
g *Silverij* Epist. i  
qua est ad *Vigilium* pseudopapam.  
h *Vix*, tempore  
*Bonifacij*.  
i Nequissimi spiritus audacia,  
ambitionis pbre-  
nesia concipiens.  
Silv. ibid.

k Contin. of the History of France, collect. by Thomas Dauter, in Lewis 11 in fine.



1 Venerabilis  
Patar. Episco-  
pus venit ad Im-  
peratorem, &  
Iudicium Dei  
consecutus est,  
de tanta sedis  
expulsione, &c.  
Liber. loc. cit.

2 Imperator re-  
vocari Romam  
Silverium iussit,  
& de literis illis  
(a Silverio ut  
aiebant ad Go-  
thos scriptis)  
Iudicium fieri,  
ut si probaretur  
&c. Liber. loc. cit.  
3 Provalente  
Imperatoris ius-  
sione Silverius  
ad Italiam re-  
ductus est. Liber.  
ibid.

4 Cuius adven-  
tu territus Vigi-  
lius ne sede pelle-  
retur, Bellisario  
mandavit, Trade  
mibi Vigilium,  
aliquis non  
possum facere,  
quod a me exi-  
git. Liber. ibid.  
5 Diffusum Theo-  
doti de Pompeio,  
apud Plut. in  
Vita Pomp.  
6 Ita Silverius  
traditus est duc-  
bus Vigily ser-  
vis, qui in Pal-  
marum insulam  
adductus, sub  
eorum custodia  
defecit inedia.  
Liber. loc. cit.  
7 Ferro scitior  
est fames. Veget.  
8 Lament. 4. 9.  
9 Melius est mori  
gladio, quam  
fame.  
10 Bin. Not. in  
vitam Vigilij.  
11 Bar. an. 540.  
Nu. 4.

the innocent and miserably afflicted Bishop *Silverius*, went<sup>1</sup> to the Emperour to plead on his behalfe; declaring both his innocency and extreme oppression. The Emperour whose delight it was to doe ju-stice to all, and relieve the innocent, especially sacred persons, and most of all the Pope, was so affected therewith, that he commanded that <sup>m</sup> *Silverius* should be brought againe from exile to *Rome*, and that there should be taken a *melius inquirendum* of the whole cause, and if he were found guilty of the treason objected, then hee should be for ever exiled; if innocent, he should be restored to his See, which *Vigilius* then usurped. *Silverius* <sup>n</sup> was hereupon brought backe with speed, and being come as neare as *Italy*, *Vigilius* was then netled in- deed, and fearing <sup>o</sup> to be dethroned, he bestirres himselfe, and stirres every stone. Then he comes againe in very earnest manner to *Bellisarius*, and tels him he will now performe all his covenants, if he would deliver *Silverius* to his custody. By which sollicitation *Silverius* the lambe was committed to the wolfe, who (intending now to make as sure worke with him, as he who sayd <sup>p</sup>, *mortui non mordent*), by two of <sup>q</sup> his servants convayed him out of *Italy* to the Iland *Palmaria*, where after all other injuries, indignities, and calamities, hee spared not the innocent life and soule of that holy Bishop, but murdered him by a kinde of languishing death, namely by famine, which <sup>r</sup> *Vegetius* and the Prophet <sup>s</sup> also judged worse than the sword.

14. And now that which onely hindred *Vigilius*, being by a strong writ *de ejectione mundi* quite removed, there was none to make oppo- sition against him, or hinder his exaltation to the *Zenith* of Pontificall dignity, but onely God, and the sting of his owne most guilty consid- erence, both which (though you may be sure he lightly regarded, yet) for abundant caution he by a fine sleight and policy will pacifie and appease: for as hitherto he had played the Wolfe and Tiger, so now you shall see him act the Foxe: and that in so lively and native man- ner, that hee meaneth to cozen not onely all men, but his owne con- science, and Almighty GOD himselfe. As hee had murdered the true & lawfull Pope *Silverius*, so in token of remorse he will needs die & kill himselfe also, being the usurping Pope: but his death is no other than they fancy of Antichrist the beast in the Apocalyps, he dyeth, but within few dayes he revives againe. He considered he had entred vio- lently & injuriously into the See; that he was as yet nothing but a mere intruder and usurper of it; the holy & conscionable man will not hold his dignity by so bad a title: and therefore <sup>t</sup> *abdicat se pontificatu*, he puts off his Popedom; & considering <sup>u</sup> how he was blemished with Symony, heresie, murder, and other crimes, that he was also excommunicated and accursed, <sup>v</sup> *a sede male occupata descendis*, he forsakes & comes downe from the papall chaire, and resignes the keyes into the hands of S. Peter or Christ, and makes the See void, that there might be a new election of a lawfull Pope. They shall chuse freely whom they will, as for him- self, either they shall bring him by a lawfull election in at the doore, or he (so conscionable is the Fox now become) wil for ever stand without: climbe in at the window he will no more; either Christ himselfe shall reach the keyes unto him, that he may be his lawfull Vicar, or open and shut who will for *Vigilius*. Thus by the death of *Silverius*, the

the true and lawful Pope, and by the abdication or resignation (which is a death in law) of the usurping Pope *Vigilius*, the See is wholly vacant, and that was, as *Anastasiu* \* witnesseth, for the space of sixe dayes.

15. In this vacancy of the See *Baronius* not onely tels you, that there was (which is not unlike) very great deliberatiō about the election of a new Pope, but, as if hee had beene present in the very conclave at that time, or as if by some Pythagoricall *metempsychosis* the soules of some of those Electors, comming from one beast to another, had at last entred into the Cardinals breast, declares their whole debatement of the matter, *pro & con*, what was said for *Vigilius*, what against *Vigilius*; which kinde of poetry, if any be pleased with, they may have abundance of it in his Annals; for my selfe, I told you before I never dreamed as yet in their Romane *Parnassus*, that I dare presume to vent such fictions & fancies: In that one he founded the depth indeed both of *Vigilius* counsels, and of the consultations of the Electors; Of *Vigilius* hee saith <sup>1</sup>, that hee gave over the Popedome, not with any purpose to leave it, but, as it were, to act a part in a comedy, and seeme to doe that which he never meant, & that he did it, <sup>2</sup> *fretus potentia Bellisarij, quod esset enim mox iterum consensurus*; because he knew, that by the meanes of *Bellisarius* hee should shortly after bee elected and placed in it againe; or, to use the Cardinals own comparifon, he did not play <sup>3</sup> at mumchance, but knowing how the election would goe after hee had given over, *haud dubiam jecit aleam*, hee knew what his cast would be, and what side of the Die would fall upward, hee knew his cast would bee better than *jactus venerens*, it would be the cast of the triple Crowne; As for the Electors <sup>4</sup> he tels us, that they chose him not for any worth, piety, vertue, or such like Pontificall qualifications, (of which they saw none in him) but to avoid <sup>5</sup> a schisme in the Church, because they knew if they should choose another, the Emperesse and *Bellisarius* would maintaine the right of *Vigilius*, and as they had thrust him in, so they would uphold and maintaine him in the See, and for this cause, at the instance of *Bellisarius*, they all with one consent chose their old friend *Vigilius*, and now make him the true and lawfull Pope, the undoubted Vicar of Christ, which was a fine cast indeed at the Dies.

16. Now though this may seeme unto others, to demonstrate great basenesse and puslanimitie in the Electors at that time, who fearing a little storme of anger or persecution, would place so unworthy a man in the Papall throne, and though it testifie the present Romane policy to be such, that if *Simon Magus*, nay, the devill himself can once but be intruded into their Chaire, & put in possession thereof, he shall be sure to hold it, with the Electors consent, if hee can but storme and threaten in a Pilates voyce to incense the Emperour, or some potent King to revenge his wrong, if they ever choose any other; yet the Cardinal who was privy to the mysteries of their Conclave, commends <sup>6</sup> this for *salubre consilium*, a very wholesome advice; & wisely was it done to chuse *Vigilius*, nay, as if that were too little, he adds, it was, *Divinitus inspiratum consilium*, God himself inspired this divine counsell from heaven into their hearts, rather to choose an ambi-

x Cessavit Episcopatus dies sex. Anast. in vit. Silv. Ex quibus intelligas Vigilium qui sedem usurpasset ad hoc tempus, minime diutius sedere perseverasse. Bar. an. 540. nu. 4 y Bar. an. 540. nu. 5. quod Vigilius id fecerit, tanquam repraesentans in scena comœdiam, non ex animo, facile mihi persuadeo. z Bar. ibid. nu. 4 Et, vester homo, hujusmodi sibi viam aperientia tuxavit, ut ob perpetrata delicta egi inde nūquam posset, secutus de Bellisarij voluntate, &c. Bar. an. 540. nu. 5. a Haud dubiam jecit aleam, cum sciret eandem quam vellet, facile reditum. Bar. ib. nu. 5. b Clerus longè abhorret, ut hominem tot criminibus implicatum in sedem cederet Pontificiam, id praesertim sacris Ecclesie legibus prohibentibus, et omnes, ut ab excedendo facinore, ab ejus electione, longè longius abhorrent. Bar. an. 540. nu. 7. c Contra, accuratius rem expenditas manifestè cernebant si aliquem eorum eligere, scindendam mox fore Ecclesiam dīno schismate, ideo divinitus inspirato consilio evocant ipsum in Pont. thronū, &c. Bar. an. 540. nu. 7. & 8. d Bar. ibid. nu. 8.

e Bar. ibid.  
 f Ab ambitioso  
 Diacono proce-  
 rata Bar. an.  
 538 nu. 9.  
 g Infana cupi-  
 ditate flagrans  
 ambitione Vigi-  
 lius. Ibid. nu. 5.  
 h En in quod ha-  
 ratrum infelici  
 hominem conse-  
 cit ambitio, in  
 quam infan-  
 tiam, & infan-  
 tiam adegit eu  
 vana glorie cu-  
 pido, cuius et ius-  
 cogatur in ipso  
 partu pati nau-  
 fragium, & in  
 Petra Petra  
 scandulum esse,  
 et in fide infid-  
 tem haberi. Ibid.  
 nu. 17.  
 i Se Theodore  
 Augusti instar  
 mancipij turpis-  
 simè vendidit.  
 Bar. an. 540.  
 nu. 8.  
 k Accipiat (The-  
 odora) nomen  
 potius ab inferis,  
 Aleto, vel Me-  
 gera, vel Tisi-  
 phone nūcupan-  
 da. Bar. an. 535.  
 nu. 63.  
 l Dum sursum  
 ascendere medi-  
 tatur, deorsum  
 demergitur. An.  
 538. nu. 38.  
 m Vagetur ne-  
 cesse est cum  
 Cain qui intus  
 clausum habet,  
 quod eum agit  
 in adversa, pec-  
 catum. Ibid.  
 n Quid reliquū  
 esse potuit salis  
 insatiati, nisi ut  
 conculetur et  
 proiciatur in  
 sterquilinū ba-  
 vesum. An. 538.  
 nu. 17.  
 o Putorem con-  
 traxit heretica  
 pravitas. Ibid.  
 p Proferri flagitavit,  
 ut tolleretur Synodum,  
 libenter suscepit  
 Vigiliū promissum ejus.  
 Hæc cum ipso sacrilego  
 sermone molita est. An.  
 536. nu. 123.  
 r Ille planè sententiā  
 Domini iudicatur  
 a fide excidere quā gloriā  
 mancipium se constituit.  
 An. 538. nu. 17.  
 s Vigiliū schismaticū,  
 an. 538. nu. 20.  
 t Aliena sedis emptor.  
 Ibid. et Symoniacus  
 labes eum deturpavit.  
 An. 540. nu. 4.  
 u Sil-  
 very meis cooperatio eum  
 redarguit. Ibid.  
 z Clamantibus undique  
 sacrilegus, an. 538. nu. 19.

ous, an hypocriticall, a Symoniacall, a schismaticall, an hereticall, a perfidious, a perjured, a murderous, a degraded, an accursed, a diabolicall person to be their Pope, rather than hazzard to sustain a snuffe of Bellisarius, or a frowne of Theodoraes countenance. Howsoever, cho- sen now *Vigilius* was by commō consent, and *solemnibus ritibus*, made the true and lawfull Pope from thence forward, and with all solemnity of their rites placed in the Papall throne, and put, not onely in the lawfull, but quiet and peaceable possession thereof, the whole Ro- mane Church approving and applauding the same. Thus *Vigilius* at last got what in his ambitious desires hee so long gaped and thirsted after: At the first onset hee sought the Papacy, but got it not; at the second turne hee got it, but by usurpation and intrusion onely; but now at this third and last bout hee hit the marke indeed, hee got the rightfull possession of it, and is now become what hee would bee, the true Biishop of Rome, and Vicar of St. Peter.

16. I have stayed somewhat long in the entrance of *Vigilius*, and yet because I have set downe no more but a very *exotro*, a naked & undee- ked narration, or as it were, onely rough hewed; I must pray the reader that hee will permit mee to set downe some few exornations and polishments of it out of Cardinall *Baronius*, for though all men knew him to bee one, whose words concerning their Popes are as smooth as oyle, and who will bee sure to say no more ill of any of them, than mere necessity and evidence of truth inforceth him, yet so unfit am I to write their Popes lives, that for want of fit termes I am inforced to borrow from him the whole garnish and varnish of this Description of *Vigilius*; heare then no longer mee, but the great Cardinall, the deare friend of *Vigilius*, telling you what a worthy man the Electors at this time chose for their Pope: heare him defining *Vigilius* in this manner; Hee was an ambitious Deacon, who by a madde & desire, burned with pride, whom thirst<sup>h</sup> of vaine glory drove into madnesse, and into the hellish gulfe, by meanes whereof he makes shipwracke in the very haven, becomes a Rocke of offence, and seemes an infidell in faith; a bondslave<sup>i</sup> to impious and hereticall *Theodora*, that is, to *Megera*<sup>k</sup>, to *Aleto* and the hellish furies, who, with *Lucifer*, desired to ascend<sup>l</sup> into heaven, and exalt his throne above the Starres, but being loaden with the weight of his heinous crimes, fals downe into the depth, w<sup>ch</sup> crimes with *Cain*<sup>m</sup> he having so inclosed in his breast, must needs wander up and down like a Vagabond: Unsavory salt<sup>n</sup>, worthy by all to bee trodden under foote, and cast into the dunghill of here- sies, who had got unto him the stench<sup>o</sup> of heretical pravity, who bound him selfe<sup>p</sup> by an obligation under his owne hand, yea by his oath also, to patronize heretikes, who promised<sup>q</sup> to abolish the faith and Councell of *Chalcedon*. It was the just iudgement<sup>r</sup> of God that hee should fall from the faith, who became a Vassall to vaine glory, a schismaticke<sup>s</sup>, a Symoniacke<sup>t</sup>, a murderer<sup>u</sup>, whose sacriledges<sup>x</sup> cried

p Passis conventis conscripta jurataque hereticorum defensione. An. 540. nu. 4. q Augusta Vigiliū sibi proferri flagitavit, ut tolleretur Synodum, libenter suscepit Vigiliū promissum ejus. Hæc cum ipso sacrilego sermone molita est. An. 536. nu. 123. r Ille planè sententiā Domini iudicatur a fide excidere quā gloriā mancipium se constituit. An. 538. nu. 17. s Vigiliū schismaticū, an. 538. nu. 20. t Aliena sedis emptor. Ibid. et Symoniacus labes eum deturpavit. An. 540. nu. 4. u Silvery meis cooperatio eum redarguit. Ibid. z Clamantibus undique sacrilegus, an. 538. nu. 19.



unto heaven, an usurper <sup>a</sup>, a violent invader, an intruder of the *Apostolike* See, a bastard <sup>a</sup> and unlawfull Pope, whom the true and lawfull Pope hath bound <sup>a</sup> with eternall chaines, against whom hee hath shot the dart <sup>b</sup> of damnation, and shewed to the whole world that he ascended into the throne, *ut lapsu graviore ruat*, that hee might have a greater and more shamefull fall, that hee did not represent <sup>c</sup>; nor was the successor of *Simon Peter*, but of *Simon Magus*, and that hee is the Vicar not of Christ, but of Antichrist, an Idol <sup>d</sup>, even the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place, and set up in the temple of God; one rightly <sup>e</sup> to bee called by no other name than a Wolfe, a Thiefe, a Robber, a Pseudobishop, and even Antichrist: and, which after all the rest is especially to bee remembered as the cloze of the Cardinals Description, all this time *Vigilius* <sup>f</sup> both was, and was known to the Electors, to be a very sound and true Catholike. A true Catholike? Such Catholikes indeed doth the Cardinall describe and commend unto the world; a Catholike Schismaticke, a Catholike heretike, a Catholike Antichrist, a Catholike Devill: If such were their *Romane* Catholikes and Catholike Popes in those ancient times, O gracious God, what manner of Catholike Popes are they in these ages? Then, and untill the yeare 600, was the golden age of the Church, their *Romane* Bishops were then like the head of *Nebuchadnezzers* Image to the late and moderne Popes, *Vigilius* a golden Bishop indeed to the brazen, iron, and clayish Popes of these later ages; the baseness of which no tongue or pen can expresse; when the gold is so full of drosse, when the heads, which give life, motion, and beeing to all the rest, are so full of abomination, what manner of Catholikes thinke you are the armes, the legs, the feet and tailes of that their *Babylonish* Image, which all must bee proportionable? But let us returne to *Vigilius*, whom, I hope, you will now confesse to be exactly and graphically described by the pensill of their owne Apelles.

17. After his instalment, wee are to come to his Acts and gests; those, I confesse, are very few in number, they are but two: *Anastasi* <sup>us</sup> a man slavishly addicted to the Papall See; was the chiefe compiler of his life, which had a man of integrity and indifferency writ, it is not unlike but many other matters had bin recorded of *Vigilius*, yet those two are very memorable, and such as most nearly touch the Pontifical office. The former concerns the performace of that promise which *Vigilius* made to *Theodora*, that when he were Pope he would abolish the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and restore *Anthimus*, *Severus*, and other *Eutychean* deposed Bishops: of it *Liberatus* <sup>g</sup> writes, that *Vigilius*, *implens promissionem suam quam Augustus fecerat, talem scripsit Epist. fufilling his promise* <sup>h</sup> which he had made to the *Empresse*, writ this Epistle. *Victor B.* of *Turē*, sheweth <sup>i</sup> also, that *Vigilius* by the means of *Antonia* the wife of *Bellisarius*, writ unto *Theodosius* of *Alexandria*, *Anthimus* of *Constantinople*, and *Severus* of *Antioch*, a good while since condemned by the *Apostolike* See, *tanquam Catholicis*, as unto Catholikes, & signified, that himselfe was of the same opinion concerning the faith with them. The summe then of the Epistle of Pope *Vigilius* was to signifie to these hereticall and deposed Bishops, that himselfe was an *Eutychean*, as they

<sup>a</sup> *Silvius* *viven*  
*is sedem usur-*  
*passit, & malis*  
*aribus natam*  
*esse, imo & in-*  
*v* *isse eum in-*  
*teligi*, an. 540.  
<sup>b</sup> *nu. 4. violentus*  
*intrusus*, an. 538.

<sup>c</sup> *nu. 11.*  
<sup>d</sup> *Agit Rom. P.*  
*tificem, quamvis*  
*spurius, et peni-*  
*tus illegitimus*,  
an. 538. *nu. 2.*  
<sup>e</sup> *a Sciens cun-*  
*ctos sibi subje-*  
*ctos, quos vel ab-*  
*solvat, vel eter-*  
*nis vinculis obli-*  
*get, auctoritate,*  
*&c.* an. 539.

<sup>f</sup> *nu. 4.*  
<sup>g</sup> *b Adversus Ro-*  
*mane Ecclesie*  
*invasorem, spu-*  
*ritique intrusum*  
*Pontificem, va-*  
*lidè telum dam-*  
*nationis intor-*  
*quet*, an. 539.

<sup>h</sup> *nu. 4.*  
<sup>i</sup> *c Silvesterius ostē-*  
*dit universis or-*  
*bi, Vigilium non*  
*referre Simonem*  
*Petrum, sed*  
*Magnum, neque*  
*Victorium Chri-*  
*sti, sed Antichri-*  
*stum.* *Ibid.*

<sup>j</sup> *d Cernebat*  
*quod rursus Ido-*  
*lum collocandū*  
*esset in Templo,*  
*consuetudamq;*  
*abominationu*  
*desolationis stan-*  
*te in loco sancto;*  
an. 540. *nu. 7.*

<sup>k</sup> *e Quoniam alia*  
*nomine quam lu-*  
*pus, fur et latro;*  
*Pseudoepiscopus,*  
*ac deniq; Anti-*  
*christus in re po-*  
*tuit appellari?*  
an 538. *nu. 20.*

<sup>l</sup> *t Cum Vigily*  
*personam satis*  
*perfectam ha-*  
*berent, eum nem-*  
*pe esse hominem*  
*verum Catholi-*  
*cum*, an. 540.

<sup>m</sup> *nu. 8.*  
<sup>n</sup> *g Lib. ca. 22.*  
<sup>o</sup> *h Viti. in Chron.*

were;

were, the Epistle it selfe, set downe both in *Liberatus* and in *Victor*; clearly testifieth the same, for therein *Vigilius* writeth thus, *eam fidem quam tenetis, Deo adiuuante, & tenuisse me, & tenere significo, I signifie unto you, that, by Gods helpe, I have held, and doe now hold the same faith which you doe*: but the Pope adds one clause further for secrecie, wel worthy observing, *Oportet ut hac qua scribo nullus agnoscat, it is needfull, that none know of these things which I write unto you*, but rather your wisdom must have me in suspition, more than any other, that so I may more easily effect, and bring to passe those things which I have begun. See you not here, as in a glasse, the deep hypocrisie and heresie of *Vigilius*? with what subtilty and closenesse he labours to undermine the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and the whole Catholike faith, even then when hee would seeme to favour it, and therefore wisheth the Eutycheans to speake of him as one who they suspected most of all to bee against them. *Liberatus* adds, that *Vigilius* under his Epistle writ a confession of his faith also, in *qua duas in Christo damnauit naturas, wherein hee condemned the teaching of two natures in Christ*: and dissolving the Tome of Pope *Leo*, hee said, *non duas Christi naturas confitemur, we doe not acknowledge two natures in Christ, but one Sonne, one Christ, one Lord composed of two natures, (to wit, two before the adunation) and againe, qui dicit in Christo duas formas, whosoever saith that there are two formes or natures in Christ, either working according to his owne property, and doth not confesse one person, one essence, anathema sit, let such a man be accursed*. Could *Arius*, *Eutyches*, or any heretike in the world more plainly condemne and accurse the Councell of *Nice*, of *Ephesus*, of *Chalcedon*, yea, the whole Catholike Church, and Catholike faith? It is here a fine sport to see how the two Cardinals, *Baronius* and *Bel-larmine*, how other pettifoggers, such as *Gretzer* and *Binius*, doe here bestirre themselves to quit *Vigilius* of this blemish, and of the heresie and impiety taught in this Epistle. First, *Vigilius* writ not this Epistle, it is but a counterfeite and forgery: Next, if hee did write it, yet he did it while he was an usurper, not when hee was the true and lawfull Pope. Lastly, hee did not hereby embrace heresie *ex animo*, nor define it as Pope, but onely by an exteriour act hee condemned the faith. Thus they toile themselves to wash the Ethiopian, and turne a Blackamore into a mike white Swanne.

18. Truly, I am exceeding loath now at the shutting up of this Treatise, and after sounding of the retreat, to enter into a new & fresh conflict, and prove *Vigilius* to have taught Eutycheanisme, as before I have shewed, that hee taught the quite contrarie heresie of Nestorianisme, might I not say, *Spēctatum satis & donatum jam rude, tandem, Quaritis hoc iterum antiquo me includere ludo?* I have not now the like vigor of minde at the putting off of the armour, as at the first comming into the field; and, to say truth, what courage can I or any have to fight against a foiled enemy, which is but to cut off a dead mans head, by proving him to bee an heretike, who is not onely proved, but by most ample judgment and sentence of the whole Catholike Church, already condemned for an heretike? yet because I have a desire to handle this whole argument concerning *Vigilius*, if the reader bee not

as much tyred as my selfe, after conquest of the generall, I will, as *Abner* did, play a little with these stragling *Asaels* in this point also; or if you please to suffer me to give ayme a while, I will onely *negociare*; commit the two Cardinals into the pit to fight it out, and day the matter betwixt themselves.

19. *Commentitum est, it is a forged Epistle*, saith Cardinall<sup>k</sup> *Baronius*, it is none of *Vigilius* writing. I here one say so, saith Cardinall *Bellarmino*<sup>l</sup>, but I say, *Vigilius scripsisse illam Epistolam, & damnasse Catholicam fidem*, that *Vigilius* did write that Epistle, and condemne the Catholicke faith, *Epistolam quidem scripsit nefariam, truly he writ<sup>m</sup> that nefarious Epistle*, unworthy of any Christian. Here is worke indeed, saying against saying, Cardinall against Cardinall, and whether Cardinall is the stronger let the spectators consider: But the best sport is, that whereas Cardinall *Baronius*<sup>n</sup> tels us, that this Epistle was written by some unskilfull Eutychean heretike, and Cardinall<sup>o</sup> *Bellarmino* tels us, that it was writ by *Vigilius*, it followeth upon the two Cardinals sayings joyned together, that *Vigilius* was both an heretike, and an unskilfull Eutychean heretike:

<sup>k</sup> Bar. an. 538. nu. 15.

<sup>l</sup> Bell. lib. 4. de Pontica. 10.

<sup>m</sup> Bell. ca. eod.

<sup>n</sup> Nomine Vigily ab aliquo Eutychemo esse suppositam, eoque imperite, ex pluribus colligi potest. Bar. an. 538 nu. 19.

<sup>o</sup> Bell. loc. cit.

<sup>p</sup> Bell. loc. cit.

<sup>q</sup> Breviarium collectum a sancto Liberato, sic inscribitur apud Rinjum, fo. 2. pa. 610.

<sup>r</sup> Pessimum nulum apparet corruptionis in libro Liberati. Bell.

<sup>s</sup> Revera non pugnat narratio Liberati, cum narratione Pontificalis. Ibid.

<sup>t</sup> Plura sunt quae persuadent. Bar. an. 538. nu. 15. et ex pluribus colligi potest. An. eod. nu. 19.

<sup>u</sup> Bar. an. 538. nu. 19.

<sup>x</sup> Inscriptio ad Dominos, demonstrat hanc Epistolam scriptam esse ad Iust. et Theodorum. Bar. ibid. y Bar. an. 548. nu. 24.

20. From their words let us come to their strokes and sad blowes, *Causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione pugnet*. Cardinall *Bellarmino* hath but one reason, but that is indeed a very sound one, like the Cat in the fable, which hath but one shift against the hounds; his reason<sup>p</sup> is the testimony of Saint<sup>q</sup> *Liberatus* who then lived, who not onely testifieth *Vigilius* to have writ this, but sets downe the very Epistle it selfe of *Vigilius*; and whereas some pretended both that *Liberatus* was corrupted by heretikes, and that his narration was contrary to their Pontificall; the Card. tels us for a certainty, that there<sup>r</sup> is neither any footstep nor print of corruption in *Liberatus*, neither doth he<sup>t</sup> herein dissent from the Pontificall. Cardinall *Baronius* boasteth<sup>u</sup> of his reason, as the Fox did in the same fable; that he had a number of sleights and shifts to deceive the dogs; but the hounds comming suddenly upon them both, the Cat skipt into a tree, which was her onely pollicy, and there shee saw the Fox with all his hundreth wiles torne in pieces: even such are Cardinall *Baronius* his sleights in this cause; hee hath many, but never a one that is worth a Rush, none that would save from tearing if the hounds should happen to come upon him. His first is, because the<sup>v</sup> Acts of the sixth generall Councell doe shew, that heretikes had counterfaieted some Epistles in the name of *Vigilius*, and particularly those bookes, which are said to be writ from *Vigilius* to *Iustinian* and *Theodora* of blessed memory. Thus say the Acts; To which the Card. assumes, *sane quidem inscriptio recitata Epistola; Truly the inscription of the Epist. recited in the name of Vigilius, ad Dominos, to my Lords*, doth demonstrate that it was written to *Iust.* and *Theodora*. Alas that this must be one of the Cardinals shifts, and that it must bee for the worth of it stiled<sup>x</sup> a demonstration: Why, there needs here, neither mastive nor hound, any beagle or brache will rent this reason into 20. pieces. First, what meant the Cardinal to expresse the words of the sixth Councell, where *Theodora* is called an Empresse of blessed memory? had he forgot what in another place<sup>y</sup> hee said, *that she died miserably*,

miserably,



miserably, being blasted by the Popes thunder-clap? Again what a demonstration is this; some Epistles were forged in the name of *Vigilius*, ergo, this is forged. *A pari*, some bookes are forged, the Cardinals Annals are some bookes, ergo, they are all forged; or some man is as wise as *Chorebus*, ergo, so is the Cardinall. Take heed, I pray you, the hounds sent not these consequences of the Cardinall, grounded on that old maxime, *A particulari non est Syllogisari*. Further yet, what a reason call you this; some bookes sent in *Vigilius* name to *Iustinian* and *Theodora*, were forged, ergo, this Epist. is forged. It is a demonstration, à baculo ad Angulum, for this Epistle was writ neither to *Iustinian*, nor to *Theodora*, but to *Anthimus*, *Theodosius* and *Severus*; The Cardinall may know this clearly by *Victor*, who testifieth the same in expresse words; he might have perceived it by *Liberatus*, who saith, that *Vigilius* writ this Epistle to heretikes; whereas not Pope *Leo* himselfe was more orthodoxall in this point than *Iustinian*, as besides infinite other proofes, is evident both by his Epistle<sup>a</sup> to *Mennas*, confirming the deposition of *Anthimus*, and by that his Epistle<sup>a</sup> written to *Epiphanius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, foure<sup>b</sup> years before *Silverius* was expelled, wherein hee professeth to embrace all the foure Councils, and hee anathematizeth all that are anathematized by any of them, declaring that he will not permit within his Empire any that oppugned those Councils. But for all this the Card. will prove by the Inscription<sup>c</sup> of this Epistle, that it written to *Iustinian* and *Theodora*. What if it were? can hee prove withall that no other Epistle or booke was writ to them in the name of *Vigilius*? No, hee never offers to prove that, and till that bee proved his reason at the best is but à particulari, some Epistle writ in the name of *Vigilius* to *Iustinian* and *Theodora* was forged, ergo, this; some man deserves a whetstone, ergo, so doth the Cardinall. Besides this inconsequence, the Antecedent is so false that I am ashamed to take the renowned Cardinall so tripping in his demonstration: The Inscription, saith hee, demonstrates that it was writ to *Iustinian* and *Theodora*. Truly the Inscription demonstrates the Cardinall to be of no truth or credit at al. The Inscription in *Liberatus* (and him the<sup>d</sup> Cardinall followeth) is *Dominis & Christis* <sup>e</sup> *Vigilius, Vigilius to my Lords and Christs*. An Inscription indeed with a witnesse, and a lesson for the Cardinall; *Iustinian* Christ, *Theodora* Christ, and yet the Cardinall rankes the one Christ among the Furies of hell, the other Christ hee condemnes to the pit and torments of hell; what a Cardinall to bee so malicious and spightfull against Christ, and Christs?

<sup>a</sup> Constitutio Iustiniani vocatur. Extat autem post finem Conc. Constantinopolitani sub Menna. 10. 2. p. 469. a Epistola illa ad Epiphanium extat. Leg. 7. Cod. de summa Trin. b Data est ea Epist. Iust. 3. Consul. Is est an. 533. c Sane quidem Inscriptio demonstrat. Bar. an. 538. nu. 19.

<sup>d</sup> Bar. an. 538. nu. 13. e Sic habetur in Lib. ca. 22. apud Bin. p. 624. b.

<sup>f</sup> Demonstrat.

21 The Inscription, saith the Cardinall, points<sup>f</sup> at *Iustinian* and *Theodora*: I rejoyce to see the Cardinall once so charitably affected, as to thinke *Iustinian* to be Christ, *Theodora* Christ, let all applaud the Cardinall in this saying; seldome shall you take him, nor will hee long persist in so good a mood or minde. The Inscription of the Epistle is to Christs, the Inscription demonstrates and points at them, as the Cardinall tels us; Christs then they were, Christs they are against the spite of all slandering tongues, Christs let them bee, and with Christ let them rest forever. But will you now see a fine sleight indeed

deed of the Cardinall, such as put downe the Fox, and Cat, and all. Truly, saith hee, the Inscription, *ad Dominos*, demonstrates, that this Epistle was writ to *Iustinian* and *Theodora*: why, what meanes this Inscription, *ad Dominos*? why doth the Cardinall clip away the one halfe of the Inscription? The Inscription in *Liberatus* is, *Dominis & Christis*; the Cardinall belike misdoubted by *Christis* could not bee demonstrated *Iustinian* and *Theodora*; *Christus* is the Popes prerogative; it demonstrates him, and therefore lest the Pope should frowne upon the Cardinall for saying this Inscription, *Dominis ac Christis*, doe demonstrate *Iustinian* and *Theodora*, hee corrupts the Text, and maimes the Inscription, and makes it to bee but *ad Dominos*, and so the Inscription, *ad Dominos*, may well point at the Emperour and Empresse.

22. Yet take the Cardinals maimed Inscription as it is, doth this title, *ad Dominos*, demonstrate the Emperour? may not one write *Domino*, or *ad Dominum*, but onely to the Emperour? how many thousand millions of Emperours will the Cardinall coine unto us? every servant, every prentise may write, *Domino*, or *Dominis*, unto their Master, and then by the Cardinals demonstration you shall have Cobblers, and Tailors, and Weavers, and all Artificers in the world turned into Emp. and their wives into Empresses; for, *sanè quidem*, verily this Inscription, *ad Dominos*, demonstrates that the Epist. is writ to the Emperour and Empresse. Doe you think, I say nor, that Philosophers and Logicians, but any elementary boy that hath learned to decline *Dominus* can hold himselfe at the hearing of such demonstrations? But to put the matter out of all doubt, and demonstrate the other demonstration to bee as idle a fancie as can devised; the Inscription which is but in brieft set downe by *Liberatus*, is fully and at large expressed by *Victor*, who lived and writ also at that time: The tenour (saith hee) of *Vigilius* Epistle is proved to bee thus, Bishop *Vigilius*, *Dominis ac fratribus*, to *Theodosius*, *Anthimus* and *Severus* Bishops, my Lords and brethren, joyned to us in the love of Christ our Saviour: What is now become of the Demonstration, *ad Dominos*? how doth the Inscription, *ad Dominos*, *sanè quidem*, truly and verily demonstrate *Iustinian* and *Theodora*, when, together with *Dominus*, is expressly set downe and named who those *Domini* were, to whom *Vigilius* writ, even three deposed hereticall Bishops?

23. The Cardinall, and *Binius* following him, will not yet let goe this demonstration, but much please themselves in a new device; The Epistle, saith hee, is inscribed also *ad Patres*, now it is unusuall for Popes to call Emperours their Fathers, and therefore sure it is but a counterfeit Epistle in *Vigilius* name: Why; but if Popes doe not use that terme, it is their owne fault, thy might justly so call Emperours, Emperours are the fathers of their whole Empire, and that in a more eminent manner than any other father, Imperiall Fathers, commanding and compelling fathers, fathers superiour to all other fathers, even to all Pontificall fathers; but where, I pray you, is that Inscription *Dominis ac Patribus*? Not in *Victor*, not in *Liberatus*, at least not in the best Edition of him, not in that which *Binius* hath set forth, there the Inscription is faire, and cleare, *Dominis ac Christis*, and yet so ridicu-

g. V. A. T. in  
Chron. sub an. 2.  
post cons. Basilij.

h. Bin. in not. ad  
Liberatum.  
S. in historia.  
i. Bar. an. 528.  
nu. 19. Abborret  
d. consuetudo scri-  
bendi more, &c.  
et, quodnam un-  
quam existit  
prædecessorum  
exemplum, ut  
Imperatores Ro-  
manus Pontifex  
Patres nomina-  
ret.

lous was *Binus*, and so foolishly addicted to *Baronius*, that he proves this Epistle to bee forged, because the Inscription is, *Dominus ac Patri- bus*, who reas himselfe in the lease before had set downe the Inscripti- on to bee *Dominus ac Christus*, let it bee *Patribus*: the Cardinall and *Bi- nus* surely doated when they concluded, that the Epistle was writ to the Emperour, for as out of *Liberatus*, but most clearely out of *Victors* words is demonstrated, it was writ to father *Anthimus*, father *Theodo- sius*, and father *Severus*: *Vigilius* might well call them *Patres*, when in the Inscription he called them Bishops <sup>k</sup>.

<sup>k</sup> *Dominus Theodosio, An- thimo et Severo Episcopis. Apud Victorem loc. cit.*

<sup>l</sup> *Bar. loc. cit.*

24. And certainly *Baronius* was conscious to himselfe, that this E- pistle was writ to Bishops, not to the Emperour and Emperesse, for as misdoubting that this would, and justly might bee replied to, his de- monstration, hee adds, *Si dicas scriptum ad Episcopos*, if you say the Epi- stle was written to Bishops, and not to the Emperour, yet even so it is a forgery also, and why? for, *Qui novus iste mos est*, what a novelty is it, and utterly unusuall; that the Pope should call his fellow Bishops, *Patres & Dominos*? or if you say that it should be read *fratribus*, and not *Patribus*, yet certainly that *procul abhorret*, is very abhorrent, that he should call the same both brethren and Lords. What is the demon- stration come now to relye upon this? It is new, It is unusuall; as if nothing that is new or unusuall were done or writ: It was new and unusuall to thrust out and murder the true Pope, yet *Vigilius* did it for all the novelty thereof. Could *Vigilius* act a matter so horrible being new and unusuall, and might not hee write a phrase, or give a title be- ing new and unusuall? It is unusuall, I trow, for Popes to call hereti- call Bishops, deposed by generall Councils, their brethren beloved in Christ, he that would honour deposed heretikes with such loving termes, would hee doubt to call them by an unusuall title, *Dominos ac Patres*, or, *Dominos ac Fratres*? and yet neither of both is so unusuall as the Cardinall would have it thought. In the Councell at *Barre*<sup>m</sup>, when the Greekes disputed against Pope *Vrbane* so eagerly against the pro- cession of the holy Ghost, that the Pope was at a *non plus*, and unable to answer, being driven to that exigent, and remembring that An- selme Archbishop of *Canterbury* was in the Councell, exclaimat he cri- ed aloud before the whole Councell, *Pater et Magister Anselme ubi es?* Oh my father and Master *Anselme* where are you? come now and defend your mother the Church. And when after much crying and shouting, they brought him in presence among them, Pope *Vr- bane* said, *includamus hunc in orbe nostro quasi alterius orbis Papam*, let us inclose him in our circle, as the Pope of the other world. Might not *Vigilius* do that to three Patriarks, which *Vrbane* did to an Archbishop? might not *Vigilius* call them fathers, as well as *Vrbane* called *Anselme* father and Master? Might not that bee done secretly, and in a private letter which the Pope did openly in the audience of the whole Councell? Is it more incongruity for the Pope to call the Patriarcke of *Alex- andria*, or of *Antioch*, his father or Lord, than to call the Patriarcke of *England*, father, master, yea, Pope in his owne Patriarchat Diocesse in *England*?

<sup>m</sup> *Guil. Malf- bur. lib. 1. de gest. Pontif. Angl. p. 127.*

25. But the Cardinall still harps on a wrong string; *Vigilius* nei- ther



ther in the Inscription, subscription, nor body of the Epistle, called them fathers, but brethren: That title is given them indeed three or foure times, both in *Liberatus* and in *Victor*, *fraternitati vestra*, *fraternitatem vestram*, & *orate pro nobis mihi fratres in Christo conjuncti*; pray for us my brethren in the Lord. Which evidently shewes, that *Baronius* and *Binius* either themselves corrupted, and followed some corrupt Edition of that Epistle, when they so craftily persist on the Inscription, *Dominis ac Patribus*; for had hee stiled them in the title fathers, hee would not in the Epistle have so often called them brethren, and never once fathers. Now to say as the Cardinall<sup>n</sup> doth; that it is abhorrent either from reason or practice to call the same parties both *Dominos* and *fratres*, argues, either extreme and supine negligence, or obstinate perversnesse in the Cardinall and *Binius*, scarce any thing in antiquity being more frequent. Pope *Damasus*<sup>o</sup> writ a Synodall letter to *Prosper* Bishop of *Numidia*, and others, he inscribes it thus, *Dominis venerabilibus & fratribus Prospero, Leoni, Reparato, Damasus Episcopus*; Bishop *Damasus* to my reverend Lords and Brethren *Prosper*, &c. So the Councell of *Carthage*<sup>p</sup> in two letters, written the one to Pope *Boniface*, the other to Pope *Celestine*, writes in both in this manner, *To our Lord and honourable brother*: So *Cyrill*<sup>a</sup> Patriarke of *Alexandria* writ to *Aurelius Valentinus*, and the other African Bishops, *Dominis honorabilibus*, to the honourable Lords, and holy brethren. In like sort *Asticus*<sup>t</sup> Patriarke of *Constantinople* to the same Africane Bishops, *Dominis sanctis*, to the holy Lords, & our most blessed brethren, fellow Bish. Why might not *Vigilius* call other Patriarks Lords and brethren; when *Articus*, *Cyrill*, the Councell of *Carthage*, yea, Pope *Damasus* himselfe called other Bishops, *Dominos ac fratres*. Nay, seeing the Pope is used to inscribe his letters to the Emp. *Dominis ac filiis*, or, *Domino ac filio*, as doth *P. Hadrian* to *Constant.* and *Irene*, & to *Charles*<sup>t</sup>, why may not he as well call his brother as his son, Lord? is the title of son more compatible with *Dominis*, than the title of brother? or whether title, thinke you, Lord or brother, may not the Pope give to his fellow Bishops? the name of brother is almost every where seene in his letters, the Cardinall envies not that unto them; it is the name of *Dominus* that seemes somewhat harsh. The Cardinall would not have the Pope call or account other Bishops his Lords; and yet how can they, even the meanest of them, but bee his Lord, when hee gladly stiles himselfe their servant, yea, servant<sup>n</sup> to every servant of the Lord? So that if the Popes Secretary were well catechized, and knew good manners, his Holines should write thus to his own servants; To my Lord Groome of my stable, to my Lord the Scull of my Kitchen; I am indeed your servant, I am *servus servorum Dei*: But let the title of the Epistle bee howsoever yee will, whether, *Dominis ac Christis*, as it is in *Liberatus*; or, *Dominis & fratribus*, as it is in *Victor*; or, *Dominis & Patribus*, as the Cardinall (without any authority that I can finde) would have it, certaine it is, that the parties to whom *Vigilius* writ it, were the three deposed Bishops to whom *Vigilius* was like to give any of all those titles, and not to the Emperour and Empresse, as the Cardinall without all shadow of truth, affirmeth, and saith that he hath demonstrated

n Vel si fratres legas, certe procul abhorret, ut eosdem dicat & Dominos. Bar. an. s. 38. nu. 19. o Epist. S. Damasii apud. Bin. to. 1. Conc. pa. 501. p Habentur in Concil. Africano sub Celest. et Bonif. ca. 101. et 105. to. 1. Conc. pa. 644. & 645. q In eodem Conc. Afric. ca. 102. r In eodem Conc. ca. 103.

f Sic Adrianus i scribit ad. Constantinum et Irenem. Tom. 3. Conc. pa. 254. t Adrianus Papa 19. eod. pa. 263.

u Servus servorum Dei, sic se scribit Gregor. 7. qui prius Hildebrandus dictus. est. Epist. 13. 14. et reliquis plus centies.

the same, but it is with such a demonstration as was never found in any but in *Chorebus* his Analyticks.

26. Another of the Cardinals reasons to prove this Epistle to be a forgery, is taken from a repugnance and contrariety of the words in the Subscription, wherein *Vigilius* first professeth to hold but one nature in Christ, and then anathematizeth *Dioscorus*, who held the same. The Cardinall should have proved, that *Vigilius* could not, or did not write contrarieties. As the Cardinall, though he hath bene so often taken tardy in contradictions, yet will not deny the Annals for that cause to bee his owne faire birth; so hee might thinke of this writing, though it bee repugnant to it selfe, yet it might proceed from such an unstayed and unstable minde, as *Vigilius* had: But I doe acquit *Vigilius* from this contradiction, it is not his, hee condemned not *Dioscorus* in his Subscription. In his Epistle he professeth to hold the same doctrine of one onely nature in Christ with *Eutyches* and *Dioscorus*; there is little reason then to thinke, that hee did in his Subscription adjoynd, condemne the professors of that doctrine, of which *Dioscorus* was one of the chiefe, as deepe in that heresie as *Eutyches* himselfe: What shall wee say then to *Liberatus*, in whom *Dioscorus* is named? Truly had not malice and spight shut the eyes of *Baronius* and *Binus*, they could not but have seene, that the name of *Dioscorus* is by the oversight or negligence of the writer, inserted in stead of *Nestorius*: It was *Nestorius* and not *Dioscorus* whom *Vigilius* there accursed, the very conclusion and coherence, not onely with the Epistle, but with the next precedent words in the Subscription, doe evidently demonstrate thus much; for having professed in his Epistle to hold, as did *Dioscorus*, but one nature in Christ, having againe in his Subscription and next words before, anathematized all who admit two, or deny but one nature in Christ, hee in particular declares who those are, that hee therein anathematized, saying, *Anathematizamus ergo*, therefore we accurse (by this our condemnation of those who deny but one nature) *Paulus Samosatenus*, *Nestorius*, *Theodorus*, and *Theodoret*, and all who have or doe embrace their doctrine. Now it was *Nestorius*, not *Dioscorus*, who embraced the same doctrine with *Paulus Samosatenus*, with *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, and *Theodoret*, all these concurred in that one and selfe-same heresie of denying one nature in Christ, they all consented in teaching two natures, making two persons in Christ, which *Dioscorus* and *Eutyches* condemned. Of *Theodorus* and *Theodoret* it is cleare by the Councils, both of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*, and the fift Synod. Of *Paulus Samosatenus*, the writing or contestation of the Catholike Clergy of *Constantinople*, set downe in the Acts of *Ephesus*, doe certainly witnesse and declare the same; the title of which is to shew, partly, *Nestoriū ejusdem esse sententia cum Paulo Samosatenō*, that *Nestorius* is of the same opinion with *Paulus Samosatenus*; and in the contestation it selfe it is said thus, *I adjure all so publish this our writing for the evident reproofe of Nestorius the heretike, as one who is convinced to teach and openly maintain, eadem prorsus qua Paulus Samosatenus, the same doctrines altogether which Paulus Samosatenus did; and then they expresse seven heretical assertions taught alike by them both.*

2 Quo pacto, ro-  
go, potuit Vigili-  
us anathematiz-  
are Diosco-  
rum, si cum Dio-  
scoro Eutychia-  
nam heresin  
predicat? Hec  
enim sibi invicem  
adversan-  
tur, ut utraque  
vera esse non  
possint. Bar. an.  
538. nu. 16. et  
idem habet Bin.  
not. in Lib. pa.  
626. a.

y Eam fidem  
quam tenetis, &  
tenere me, et te-  
nuisse significo.  
Epist. Vigilius tñ  
apud Liber. ca.  
22. et Viñ. Tan.  
in Chron. an. post  
Const. Basily 2.  
x Qui dicit in  
Christo duas for-  
mas, et non cōfi-  
setur unam per-  
sonam, unam ef-  
ficientem, Anathe-  
ma sit. Ibid. apud  
Liber.

u To. 1. ad Conc.  
Eph. ca. 11.

both. Seeing then *Vigilius* accursed him who taught the same with *Paulus*, *Theodorus*, and *Theodoret*, and that was *Nestorius*, not *Dioscorus*: it is undoubtedly certaine, that not *Dioscorus*, but *Nestorius* was the party written and named by *Vigilius* in his subscription: and that *Dioscorus* was not by *Vigilius*, but by the oversight and negligence of the exscriber of *Liberatus*, wrongfully inserted in stead of *Nestorius*. And truly the like mistakings are not unusuall in *Liberatus*. In this very Chapter it is sayd that *Vigilius* a little after the death of *Agapetus*, and election of *Silverius*, when he came from *Constantinople* to *Rome* with the Empresse her letters for placing him in the *Romane* See, he found<sup>b</sup> *Bellisarius* at *Ravenna*; a manifest mistaking of *Ravenna* for *Naples*; for there, and not at *Ravenna* was *Bellisarius* at that time, as by *Procopius*<sup>c</sup> is evident: and because this is no way prejudiciall to their cause, *Baronius* and *Binius* can there willingly admit<sup>d</sup> an error or slip of memory in *Liberatus*, and not so hastily conclude as here they doe; that because *Bellisarius* was not then at *Ravenna*, as in *Liberatus* is falsly affirmed, therefore that Chapter of *Liberatus* is forged, and not truly written by him. Would his Cardinalship have beene as favourable to *Liberatus* in naming *Dioscorus* for *Nestorius*, which the like evidence of truth and all the circumstances doe necessarily enforce, the Epistle might as well passe for the true writing of *Vigilius*, as that Chapter for the writing of *Liberatus*. In this very Epistle of *Vigilius*, it is said in *Liberatus*<sup>e</sup>, I know, quia ad Sanctitatem vestram fidei mea crudelitas pervenit, that the cruelty of my faith is before this come to your eares; and the very same word of crudelitas fidei is in *Victor* also, which argues the fault to be very ancient. It is true that the faith of *Vigilius* was indeed cruell, for he by it crtielly condemned, abolished, and as it were murdered the Councell of *Chalcedon*, that is in truth, the whole Catholike faith: and so this happened to be not onely a true, but a fit and significant error. Yet the Cardinall was so friendly and charitable here; as to thinke that it was but a slip of the penne, or negligence of the writer; in saying crudelitas, for credulitas, as the Cardinall readeth<sup>f</sup> it; might not by the like negligence; and with lesse disgrace to *Vigilius*, *Dioscorus* slip into the text in stead of *Nestorius*? In the inscription of the Epistle *Liberatus* reads it, Dominis ac Christis; *Victor*, Dominis ac fratribus; the Cardinall corrects both; and makes it worst of all, Dominis ac patribus. May he play the Criticke, and turne *Christis*, or *fratribus*; into *patribus*, and that without, nay against reason, and may not others in the subscription restore *Nestorius* for *Dioscorus*, when the truth and necessary circumstances enforce that correction? It was *Nestorius* then not *Dioscorus* whom *Vigilius* accursed; it is but the error or corrupt writing of *Vigilius* Epistle in *Liberatus*, (which wee also condemne) and not the Epistle of *Vigilius* at which the Cardinall unjustly quarrelleth.

27. His third and last shift is worst of all. If *Vigilius* had indeed writ this Epistle, why then (saith he e) was it not upbraided unto him at *Constantinople*, neither by the Empresse *Theodora*, when shee contended with him, about the restoring of *Anthimus*, nor by *Theodorus* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, and *Mennas*, when *Vigilius* excommunicated them both; and they

b Quin & Ravenna reperit Bellisarium. Liber. ca. 22. c Nam Silverius ait ejusdem Bellisario. p. 287 id fuit anno 3. belli Gothici, ne liquet ex p. 313 ubi ait, Tertium belli hujus annus exibat, as Bellisarius non capie Ravennam ante finem anni 5. ejus belli, ut ait Procopius. 340. & 343. ubi ait, Iam annus 5. exibat. d Hic patet Liberatus memoria lapsus, Ravennam pro Neapoli posuisse. Bar. an. 538. nu. 7. & idem Binius. Not. in Liber. e Apud Binius. 10. 2. p. 614. f Bar. an. 538. nu. 14.

g Bar. an. 538. nu. 15.



waxed him so long; nor by the Emperour Iustinian, when he was furiously enraged against him; nor by the fifth Synod, which was offended with him for refusing to come to the Councell; nor yet by Facundus, when he writ angrily against him? these were publicly debated, *nec tamen de dicta epistola, vel usquam mentio*; yet is there not any mention, or light signification of any such Epistle. Thus the Cardinall. Of whom I againe demand where he learned to dispute *ab autoritate humanâ negativè*; the old and good rule was, *Neque ex negativis rectè concludere si vis*; but the Cardinall hath new Analytickes, and new-found rules of Art, *Ex negativis poteris concludere si vis*. Himselfe witnesseth<sup>h</sup> and proclaimeth *Vigilius* to have beene a Symoniack, and to have compacted with *Bellisarius* for 200. peeces of gold, to have beene excommunicated, deposed, degraded, by Pope *Silverius* pronouncing that sentence out of his *Apostolike* authority, and from the mouth of God: why was not this Symony, why was not this censure of *Silverius* upbraided, neither by *Theodora*, nor *Theodorus*, nor *Iustinian*, nor the fifth Councell, nor *Facundus*? that being a publike and knowne censure, had been a matter of farre greater disgrace to *Vigilius*, farre more justifiable than the epistle writ privately and secretly to *Anthimus*, and commanded by *Vigilius* to bee kept close that none might know it. See you not how vaine this shift of the Cardinall is? How it crosseth him in his Annals, to slander *Vigilius* as symoniackall, as censured by *Silverius*, both which seeing they are not upbrayded to him by the forenamed persons, but set downe in the Cardinals Analytickes, sure they are impostures, and forgeries. What though none of them upbrayded this Epistle unto him? Is it not enough that it is assuredly testified and recorded by *S. Liberatus*, by Bishop *Victor*, two who lived and writ at that same time? what if most of them knew not of this Epistle, which was sent secretly by *Vigilius*, and by his advice kept closely by *Anthimus* and *Severus*? what if they all knew it, and yet having other crimes enough to object, thought it needlesse to mention that, as it seemes they did the Symony of *Vigilius*, and censure of *Silverius*? what if they were not so spitefull as the Cardinall is, and therefore would not say the worst they could against his Holinesse?

28. But see the strange dealing of the Cardinall! How or why should *Theodora* upbrayd this to *Vigilius* for the not restoring of *Anthimus*? that quarrell for the restoring of *Anthimus* (as I have often sayd, and clearly proved) was a meere devise and fiction of *Anastasius*, it was nothing but *Alcibiades* dogs tayle. Or how should *Iustinian* upbraid it, when he was so enraged against *Vigilius*, and persecuted him for not restoring *Anthimus*? Seeing neither *Iustinian* persecuted *Vigilius*, nor was enraged against him, but for the space of five or six yeares they both sang one note, they fully conformed together? or how should *Mennas* and *Theodorus* upbraid it, when they were excommunicated by *Vigilius*? Seeing that excommunication, & all the circumstances of it are merely fictitious, as by the death of *Mennas* (which was long before that forged excommunication of him) was demonstrated? Are not these worthy reasons to disprove this Epistle to bee writ by *Vigilius*, which all relie on fictions, & on most untrue and idle fancies? And whether

<sup>h</sup> Bar. locis sup.  
citat.

whether *Facundus* upbraided it or no, may bee questioned, nor will it bee clearly knowne, untill they will suffer *Facundus* to come out of their *Vaticane*, where hee lyeth yet imprisoned. But as, for the fift Councell, it was great fillinesse in the Cardinall, once to thinke that they should or would upbraid this Epistle to him, they used the Pope in the most honourable and respectfull manner that could be wished, they uttered no one harsh or hard word against him, but what was rightly said or done by him; as his condemning of *Origen*, his condemning the *Three Chapters* before the time of the Councell; that they often mention and approve it also. They sought by lenity to win the Popes heart to consent unto the truth, which they defended: seeing they could not prevaile with him; yet they would have the whole world to testifie, together with the Popes peevishnesse, their owne lenity, equity and moderation used towards him, and that it was not hatred or contempt of his person; nor any precedent occasion, but onely the truth and equity of that present cause, which enforced them to involve him (remaining obdurate in his heresie) in that *Anathema* which they in generall denounced against all the pertinacious defenders of the *Three Chapters*, of which *Vigilius* was the chiefe, and standard-bearer to the rest. Did the Cardinall thinke with such poore sleights to quit *Vigilius* of this Epistle? If nothing else, truely the very imbecillity and dulnesse of the Cardinals reasons and demonstrations in this point may perswade, that *Vigilius* and none but he was the author of it. *Baronius* was too unadvised without better weapons to enter into the sand, with old Cardinall *Bellarmino* in this cause, who is knowne to bee, *plurimarum palmarum vetus ac nobilis gladiator*, and in this combate with *Baronius* hee hath played the right *Eutellus* indeed. Come, let us give to him in token of his conquest, *corollam & palmam*, and let *Baronius* in remembrance of his soile, leave this Epistle to *Vigilius*, with this Impresse;

*Vigilia scriptum hoc; Eutello palma feratur.*

29. *Vigilius* now, by just Duell, is proved to bee the true author of this Epistle: Be it so, say they <sup>k</sup>, yet that is no prejudice at all to the *Apostolike See*, because he writ it in the time of *Sylverius*, while as yet *Vigilius* was not the lawfull Pope, but an intruder and usurper, and Pseudopope, and herein they all joine hand in hand, *Bellarmino* with *Baronius*, *Gretzer* and *Binius* with them both. But feare not the taitles of these smoaking firebrands; nor the wrath of *Rhesin*, *Aram*, and *Remalius* sonne; because they have taken wicked counsell against the truth. Nor needed there here any long contention about this matter, for how doe they prove this saying of theirs, that *Vigilius* writ it whē *Sylverius* lived, and not afterwards. Truly by no other but the *Colliers* argument. It is so, because it is so, proove they have none at all, they were so destitute of reasons in this point, that laying this for their foundation to excuse the Pope for teaching heresie, they begge this, on rather take it without begging or asking, by vertue of that place called, *Petitio Principij*. Let us pardon *Binius* and *Gretzer*, who gathered up onely the scraps under the Cardinals tables, but for a Cardinal so basely and beggarly to behave himselfe, as to dispute from such so-

<sup>k</sup> Etiam si ista, verè scriptiss. & *Vigilius*, nullum tamen ob id inferatur præjudicium Apostolicæ sedis, cuius tunc ipse erat invasor, *Silverius* autem germanus Pontifex. *Baron.* 538. nu. 19. Fecit id cum adhuc vivere *Silverius*, quo tempore *Vigilius* non erat Papa, sed Pseudopapa. *Bel.* lib. 4. de Pont. ca. 10. Non mirum si Pseudopapæ et quasi Antichristus ad schisma, heresin addidisset. *Binius* not. in *Lib. p. 636. a. ita etiam Gretzer in Defens. ca. 10. lib. 4. Bell.*

phistical topicks, is too foule a shame and blemish to his wit and learning. And why may not wee take upon us the like Magisteriall authority, and to their, I say it is so, oppose, I say it is not so? Doe they thinke by their bigge lookes, and *sesquipedalia verba*, to downface the truth?

30. But because I have no fancy to this Pythagorically kinde of learning, there are one or two reasons which declare, that *Vigilius* writ this Epistle after the death of *Silverius*, when he was the onely and true lawfull Pope; for the former is the narration of *Liberatus*, who in a continued story of these matters, after the death of *Silverius* relates how *Vigilius* writ this; *Silverius*, saith he<sup>1</sup>, dyed with famine; *Vigilius autem implens promissum*, And *Vigilius* to fulfill his promise, writ this Epistle. Oh, saith *Gretzer*<sup>m</sup>, *Liberatus* useth here an anticipation, and sets downe that before which fell out after: Prove that *Gretzer*; Prove it? why, his prooffe is like his Masters, It is so, because it is so: Other prooffe you shall have none of *Gretzer*: He thought, belike, his words should passe for currant pay, as well as a Cardinals, but it was too foolish presumption in him to take upon him to dispute so *Cardinaliter*; that is, without reason; why should it not be thought, seeing we find nothing to the contrary, that *Liber.* in his narration followed the order and sequell of things and times, as the law of an historian requires, rather than beleeeve *Gretzers* bare saying, that it is disorderly and contrary to the order of the times and event of things?

31. This will further appeare by the other reason drawne from the time when this Epistle was written: *Baronius* referres it to the yeare 538. wherein *Silverius* was expelled, and saith<sup>a</sup>, that though *Vigilius* had truly writ it, yet it is no prejudice to the *Apostolike* See, *cujus tunc ipse invasor*, of which hee was an invader and intruder at that time when it was written. But the Cardinal is mistaken in this point, for it is cleare and certaine by the testimony of *Liberatus*<sup>o</sup>, that *Vigilius* had not writ this Epistle when *Silverius* returned out of exile from *Patara* into *Italy*; for *Vigilius* hearing of the returne of *Silverius*, and being in great feare of losing the *Popedome*, hee hastened then to *Bellisarius*, and intreated him to deliver *Silverius* into his custody, otherwise, said hee, *non possum facere quod à me exigit*, I cannot doe that which you require me. *Bellisarius* required of him two things, as the same *Liberat.* witnesseth, the one to performe his promise to the *Empresse*, & that was the overthrowing of the Council at *Chalcedon*: the other, to pay him the two hundred pieces of Gold, which hee promised to himselfe; whereby it is most evident, that at *Silverius* returning into *Italy*, *Vigilius* had done neither of these, and so nor writ this Epistle. Now it is most likely, that *Silverius* returned into *Italy*, an. 540. for seeing he dyed in the month of *June* that yeare, and being presently upon his returne sent away into the *Iland* of *Palmaria* by *Vigilius*, a little time, you may be sure, would serve to furnish an old & disheartened man. But *Gretzer* easeth us in this point, and plainly professeth, that this Epistle was writ in that same yeare 440. wherein *Silverius* dyed. If now you doe consider how little time there was betwixt the death of *Silverius*, and his delivery to *Vigilius*, and how in that short time

l *Liber.* ca. 22.

m *Gret.* loc. cit.

n *Bar.* an. 538.

nu. 14. 15.

o *Lib.* loc. cit.

p *Augusta* *Vigili-*

um profiteri

flagitavit ut si

Papa fieret tolle-

ret Synodum,

&c. *Liberatus*

suscepit *Vigilius*

promissum. *Liber.*

loc. cit.

q *Silverius* hoc

anno obiit, 12.

Kelend. *Julij.*

Ba. an. 540. nu. 2

r Ita *Silverius*

traditus duobus

*Vigilijs* servis,

qui in *Palma-*

rium ablatum

sub eorum custo-

dia defectu in-

dia. *Lib.* loc. cit.

s *Notus* *Silverij*

fuit an. 540. vi

hoc ipso die

anno *Vigilius* ad

*Theodorum*

scripsit, promissa

exsolvere volens;

*Gretz.* def. ca. 10

lib. 4. de Pont.



time also *Vigilius* had a greater worke, and of more importance to looke unto, than the writing of letters to deposed Bishops, to wit, to provide that *Silverius* should not live, that himselfe should not bee expelled his owne See, and how upon *Silverius* death himselfe might be againe lawfully chosen Pope; none I thinke will suppose that *Vig.* writ this before *Silverius* death in that yeare; but after it, and after all his troubles ended, when hee having quiet possession of the See, had leisure to thinke on such matters. But why stay I in the prooffe hereof, this being clearly testified by *Nauclerus*, who thus writeth<sup>1</sup>, *Silverius being dead, Vigilius was created Pope, quod postquam compertit Theodora, which when Theodora understood, she writ unto him to performe his promise about Anthimus, but Vigilius answered, farre be this from me, I spake unwisely before, and I am sorry for it.* So *Nauclerus*; who therein no doubt followed *Anastasius*, for hee<sup>2</sup> having set downe both the same motion made by *Theodora*, and the answer given by *Vigilius*, *Binius*<sup>3</sup> observes, that this was done when *Vigilius* was now the rightfull and true Pope: wherefore seeing *Theodora* writ to Pope *Vigilius*, and that after the death of *Silverius*, to performe his promise, it is certaine, that before then he had not done it, and so that untill hee was the onely true and lawfull Pope hee did not write this Epistle, which would have given full content to *Theodora*; and seeing againe we have clearly proved that hee did write it; it remaineth that hee writ it after the death of *Silverius*, when himselfe was the onely lawfull and true Bishop of Rome. One doubt in this matter remaineth, which *Binius*<sup>4</sup> sleightly mentioneth, for that *Vigilius* after he was true Pope, did not onely anathematize *Anthimus*, and confirme his deposition, but professe himselfe also to defend the Councell of *Chalcedon*, as appeares both by his Epistle to *Iustinian* and *Mennas*, dated foure months<sup>5</sup> after hee was the true Pope; and by that answer, which, as *Anastasius* and *Nauclerus* say, hee sent (in<sup>6</sup> writing) to *Theodora*, that hee would not now restore *Anthimus*; being an heretike: Whence it may bee collected, that after he was once the true and lawfull Pope, *nihil horum dixerit, scripserit vel egerit*, *Theodora* herselfe said, writ, nor did any such thing, as it is expressed in this Epistle, for confirming the heresie of *Eutyches*; for how is it credible, that he should write both these, being directly contrary the one to the other?

God answer, that had *Vigilius* bin an honest man, or a man of credit, of constancie, and resolution, he would never have thought or dreamed to write both those. But *Vigilius* was *per paucorum hominum*, you may goe through the whole Catalogue of the Roman Popes, (and there is the best sort of wicked men in all formes and fashions of impiety to be found) and not picke out such a *Polipus*, a turncoate, a weather-coke, as Pope *Vigilius*. *Baronius* compares him to King *Saul*, and saith, *quod sicut sicut Saul, sicut Saul*, as hee was made the true Pope, hee was then *Saul* in an Prophetas. It is true in many things, hee was like King *Saul*, but in that act of prophesying, wherein the Cardinal compares them, there is a marvellous dissimilitude betwixt them; *Saul* was moved by Gods Spirit, *Vigilius* by his owne will; *Saul* was acted and driven to utter those propheties, which God put into his mouth, *Vigilius* him-

selfe

<sup>1</sup> Nauc. Gener.  
18.

<sup>2</sup> Anast. in vit.  
Vigilij.  
<sup>3</sup> Ecd. ut Vigil.  
statim ac (an-  
thasidem) af-  
cendit, &c. Bin.  
not. in vit. Vig.

<sup>4</sup> Bin. not. in vit.  
Vig. § Ex Actis

<sup>5</sup> Epist. Vigily  
ad Mennam 15  
Calend. Octob.  
data est. Ea ex-  
tas apud Bar. an.  
540. nu. 25.  
et eodem tempo-  
re missa est etiam  
illa ad Iustinia-  
num, apud Bar.  
an. 540. nu. 15.  
et 22.

<sup>6</sup> Ad hoc re-  
scripsit Vigilius,  
Anast. in vit.  
Vigilij.  
b Bar. an. 540.  
nu. 23.

selfe did guide and move his tongue, and turned it with the rudder  
 of his unconstant minde, when, and whithersoever hee would; *Saul*  
 prophesied of necessity, not being able to resist Gods motion, *Vigilius*  
 in hypocrisie being desirous to please and humour other men: in a  
 word, *Saul* had the gift, *Vigilius* the art or juggling trickes of prophesy-  
 ing. When he would seeme to be that w<sup>ch</sup> indeed and in heart he was  
 not, a Catholike Bishop, and gaine the favour of *Iustinian* a Catho-  
 like Emperour, not *Saul*, nor scarce *Paul* more orthodoxall than *Vigili-  
 us*; when hee would open his heart and declare what hee was *intus &  
 in cute*, not *Eutyches* or *Nestorius* more damnably heretical than *Vigili-  
 us*. In his Epistle written secretly to *Theodosius*, *Anthimus*, and *Severus*,  
 he opens to them his true intent and minde, that hee was of one faith  
 with them, an Eutychian as they were, and so assures them that hee  
 would doe what hee could for them, when opportunity <sup>b</sup> should be of-  
 fered. In his Epistles to the Emperour, Empreffe, and *Mennas*, which  
 were to bee publike and seene of all, hee makes a shew of love to the  
 truth, and to the Councell of *Chalcedon*, which even then hee meant, if  
 opportunity were once offred, to adnull & abolish for ever. I here re-  
 member a narration, not unworthy observing, which long since a man  
 of great gravity and judgement in law, and now one of the chiefe  
 Iudges in this Realme, related unto me, how one of the most notori-  
 ous Traytors in the time of our late *Queene* of happy memory, ha-  
 ving by solemne vow, by oath, by receiving the holy Sacrament,  
 bound himselfe to murder his Sovereigne, returned home from *Italy*,  
 but with such a shew of zeale towards our religion, our State, and his  
 Sovereigne, that in open Parliament (being chosen a Burgesse) hee  
 made a very spightfull and violent invective against Recusants, and  
 specially against Iesuites: His Paymasters and friends of *Rome*, expul-  
 sulating with him then about the matter. Oh, quoth he, it was need-  
 full I should thus doe, now all feare, nay suspicion of me is quite remo-  
 ved, I have by this my open speech gained trust and credit with the  
 Prince, with the Councell, and the whole State. I have now made an  
 easie and free accessse to performe that holy worke. And if God had  
 not watched over Israell, and his Anoynted, many times without  
 suspicion and danger he might have done, and had done it indeed. Sel-  
 dome are great villanies attempted but with great hypocrisie: such  
 deepe dissembling is no novelty at *Rome*. Pope *Vigilius* was not to be  
 taught this lesson; no treason more horrible than his was at this time.  
 Hee undertakes <sup>c</sup> and bindes himselfe by his own handwritting, by his  
 oath also, (the Sacrament was not as yet growne to be an obligation  
 of such detestable designes) to overthrow and abolish for ever the  
 Councell of *Chalcedon*, and with it the whole Christian faith; his pur-  
 pose and resolution of heart hee signifies in his hereticall Epistle;  
 which, as it seemes, hee writ very shortly after hee was the true and  
 lawfull Pope, to *Anthimus*, *Severus*, and *Theodosius*, and sent it pri-  
 vately to *Theodora*. While hee is meditating and seeking how to ef-  
 fect this, the Emperour writes unto him, requiring him to approve  
 that faith which *Leo*, *Celestine*, *Agapetus*, and others his predecessors  
 had embraced, and particularly to confirme the deposition of *Ascle*.

b Scribit ut sine  
 omnia occulta  
 usq; ad tempus.  
 Bell. lib. 4. de  
 Pont. ca. 10.

c Vigilius factu  
 promissionis Ro-  
 manum professus  
 est. Liber. ca. 22.  
 redierunt ipsum,  
 hereticorum  
 pactis conventis  
 conscripta, jura-  
 mento desinso.  
 Bar. an. 540.  
 m. 4.

*mus, Severus, and Theodosius.* What should *Vigilius* here doe? had he refused to yeeld to the Emperours just motion, hee had bewrayed himselfe, and his minde; and then not onely the Emperour and Gracians, but even his owne Romane Church (then orthodoxall and Catholike) would have expelled him for an heretike, and so hee had deprived himselfe of all possibilitie ever to effect his hereticall intendment: Hee saw it was most needfull for him to put on the visor of a Catholike profession, and therefore after his sacrifice and prayer to *Laverna*, *Pulcrâ Laverna da mihi fallere, da justum sanctumq; videri*; then in that counterfeited habit of holinesse he writ those open letters to *Iustinian*, to *Mennas*, and to *Theodora*, so orthodoxall and Catholike, that none by them in the world could otherwise judge of him, but that he was another *S. Silvester*, *S. Caelestinus*, or *S. Leo*; When by this he had gained, first, the reputation of sanctity in the Church; then the good will of the Emperour and the love of all Catholikes, when every man now held *Vigilius* his Apostolicall letters or decrees for so many Oracles; and himselfe for an Apostle and Prophet sent from heaven to instruct them, then, and not before, was it time to worke his intended feat; then, and never before, hee was to publish his Apostolicall decree (his minde was as yet but private) for overthrow of the Catholike faith, and the Councell of *Chalcedon*: But it so happened; that the heresie of the *Eutychians* was so generally odious, and so lately condemned, that there was no likelihood for him to bring his purpose about by establishing it, as at the first he meant, but after some few yeares expectation there fell out another & farre fitter opportunity; & that was the defence of the *Three Chapters*, there he had the *Africans*, the *Ilirians*, the *Italians*, and, in a manner, all the Westerne Churches to partake with him in that heresie; that opportunity *Vigilius* gladly embraceth, nor would hee let it passe: Then hee labours tooth and naile; and in the end, when either then or never he must do the deed, by his Apostolicall Const. he decreeth that those 3. Chapters should by al be defended. Certainly, had that his decree prevailed, (as his purpose and earnest desire was that it should) not only *Anthemius*, *Theodosius*, & *Severus*, being *Eutychians*, but all *Arians*, *Macedonians*, all heresies and heretikes, had at once, like so many wilde Bores, rushed into the inheritance of Christ; the Catholike faith, which is the only barre and fence against them all, being by that Constitution of *Vigilius* utterly broken downe, and by the defending of those *Three Chapters*, for ever subverted. This was the most Diabollicall plot and project of Pope *Vigilius*, to seeme a Catholike, and openly to professe before *Iustinian* and others the Catholike faith, and while they are secure of him, closely in the meane space to undermine and blow up at once all Catholikes, and with them the Catholike faith. So there is no repugnance, no incoherence at all in these, though contradictory letters of *Vigilius*, both of them, the orthodoxall to *Iustinian*, *Theodora*, and *Mennas*, the hereticall to *Anthemius*, *Theodosius*, and *Severus*, both were writ by *Vigilius*, both by Pope *Vigilius*, both by *Vigilius*, when he was the onely true and lawfull Pope; but the former were writ by the personated and visored, the later by the naked and unmasked Pope *Vigilius*.



33. Wee have now proved, first, that *Vigilius* writ this hereticall Epistle against their first evasion, next that hee writ it when hee was the onely true and lawfull Pope, against their second evasion; there remains as yet two other Pretences of *Bellarmino*, but such, as *Baronius* was ashamed to use so poore and petty excuses for their Pope. The third evasion then is this, that *Vigilius* in heart embraced the true faith, and onely fained himselfe in this Epistle to be a favourer of the Eutychean heresie. *Vigilius*, saith the Cardinall <sup>d</sup>, was here in a great strait, for if hee openly professed heresie, hee feared the Romanes, who would never indure an heretike to sit in *Peters Chaire*; if hee should on the other side professe himselfe a Catholike, he feared *Theodora* the hereticall Emperesse, that she would not indure him; *Itaque rationem illam excogitavit, & therefore he devised this policy*, (and I pray you note it well) that <sup>e</sup> at *Rome* (or openly) hee would play the Catholike, but (secretly) in his private letters to the Emperesse, and to *Anthimus*, he would faine himselfe an heretike. Thus *Bellarmino*, who fully expresth the nature and disposition of Pope *Vigilius*, as if hee had not onely felt his pulse, but beene in his bosome: Hee was indeed another *Catiline*, *Simulare, ac dissimulare*, hee could seeme and dissemble, conceale what indeed hee was, seeme to bee what hee was not: At *Rome*, and in shew of the world a Catholike; at *Constantinople*, and in his secret and close actions an heretike: Thus farre the Cardinall saith well; but hee is extremely mistaken in one circumstance, in that hee saith, that his open or Catholike profession was mentall, and *ex animo*, and his private and secret detestation of the Catholike faith, was verball and fained. It was quite contrary, his heart and Intrals were all hereticall, nothing but his face and outward shew was Catholike: for prooffe whereof I will not urge, that the Pope in this Epistle accurseth and <sup>f</sup> anathematizeth all who hold the Catholike faith; or who beleeve otherwise than *Eutyches* did, for so hee doth also in his other Epistle to the Emperour and *Mennas*, condemne Eutycheanisme; and yet it is no commendation for his Holinesse, either to curse the Catholike faith, or to curse that faith which in his heart hee beleeveeth. But this I would have considered; that *Vigilius* promised <sup>g</sup> under his hand-writing, yea, hee swore <sup>h</sup> also that he would abolish the Council of *Chalcedon*, and restore *Anthimus*; for performace whereof hee writ <sup>i</sup> that private Epistle, which was all that as yet hee could doe. Let *Bellarmino* now say, if their Popes doe use to promise; and that under their hands, yea, to sweare also to doe that, which they meane not to doe. Who may bee beleeved upon their words, upon their oathes, if not the Popes Holinesse? if hee, not onely in words and writing, but in his solemne oathes equivocate; whose oath, among all that generation, can bee thought simple and without fraud?

34. Again; to what end should Pope *Vigilius* dissemble secretly and among his intire friends, such as were *Anthimus*, *Theodosius*, and *Severus*? where or to whom should he truly open himselfe and his inward heart, if not to such? The first lesson that men of *Vigilius* mettall learne, is that of *Lucilius* <sup>k</sup>, *Homini amico ac familiari non est mentiri*

<sup>d</sup> Bell. lib. 4. de Pontif. ca. 10. § Sciendum.

<sup>e</sup> Vt Roma Catholicum ageret, et interim per litteras apud Imperatricem, hereticum simularet. Bell. ibid.

<sup>f</sup> Qui dicit in Christo duas formas (i. naturas) et non confitetur unam personam unam essentiam anathema sit. Vigil. in Epist. apud Liber. loc. cit.  
<sup>g</sup> Adimple nobis quae promissa voluntate promissisti. Anast. in vita Vigil.  
<sup>h</sup> Conscriptaque jurataque hereticorum defensor. Bar. an. 440. nu. 4.  
<sup>i</sup> Vigilius implens promissionem suam quam Augustus fecerat, tale scripsit Epistolam. Liber. ca. 23.  
<sup>k</sup> Ex quo citat Lactant. lib. 6. divin. Inst. ca. 18.

incum;

*mem.* The *Priscilians*, who as *S. Austen*<sup>1</sup> shewes, were the very teachers of lying and dissembling, and who perswaded their fellow heretikes unto that base art and trade; yet even they taught that Lucilian lesson, (and most impiously pretended<sup>m</sup> to collect it out of the words of the Apostle) Speake the truth every man to his neighbour, for we are members one of another: To his neighbour and fellow member, sayd they, we must speake the truth: but to such as are not joynd<sup>a</sup> to us in the neighbourhood or fellowship of the same Religion, and who are not of the same body with us, to them *loqui licet oportetq; mendacium*, to them you may lye, nay you must not speake the truth to such. *Anthimus*, *Severus*, and *Theodosius*, they were the next neighbours to *Vigilius*, all conjoynd<sup>o</sup> and concorporated into *Eutycheanisme*. Had he dissembled with them, he had beene worse than the *Priscilianists*, nay worse than the devils themselves, for they though they lye to all others, yet speake truth among themselves, and to *Beelzebub*, otherwise his kingdome could not endure. It was *Iustinian* and the Catholikes, who were of a contrary religion to *Vigilius*, there was little or no neighbourhood at all betwixt them: they were not concorporall; not members of one body with him, to them not being his neighbors, & *commembres* with him by the rules of that blacke Art, he might, he ought to lye: but to *Anthimus* and *Severus*, being of one body with him, he must speake the truth.

35. Further yet, looke to that old Cassian rule, *Cui bono?* where, and with whom was Pope *Vigilius* to gaine more by his cogging and counterfeiting? He had now rightfull possession of the See of *Rome*, which was the onely mark he aymed at. What hurt could three deposed Bishops, or the Emperesse her selfe doe now unto him, being backt by the Emperour, by all Catholikes, and which is best, by a good cause? what needed he for pleasing them to faine himselfe an heretike? Could they thrust *Vigilius* from his See, who could not hold their owne? or could the Emperesse deprive *Vigilius*, who could not restore *Anthimus*? There was nothing that could move *Vigilius* to faine himselfe an heretike, or to write that hereticall Epistle, if he had been in heart a Catholike. But being in heart hereticall, there was many most urgent and necessary inducements, why he should faine himselfe a Catholike. Had hee shewed his inside unto the Emperour, and the Church, had he opened to them the heresie lurking in his brest, had he made it knowne that he would abolish the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and the Catholike faith, hee had instantly incensed all against him; both the Emperour and the Romanes, as *Bellarmino*<sup>p</sup> sayth, yea the whole Catholike Church would have joynd in the expulsiſng and depoling of such a wolfe and wretched heretike out of the See. *S. Peters* Chaire had beene too hot for him. *Vigilius* wisely considered that it was no lesse art to keepe, than to get the See; he knowing that without deepe dissimulation, and without faining himselfe a Catholike, he could not possibly hold it, much lesse could he effect that which he purposed, and had both promised and sworne to performe, and therefore by his private letter assuring *Anthimus*, *Severus*, *Theodosius*, and *Theodora*, of his hearty and serious intent to joyne with them, and when

<sup>1</sup> Exhortatur suos ad mendacium, tanquam & exemplis Prophetarum, Apostolorum, Angelorum, et ipsius Christi. Aug. lib. contr. Mend. ca. 2. in Aug. ibid. in eam cu qui nobis in societate veritatis proximi non sunt, neq; ut ita dicam commembres nostris sunt. Ibid. o Grati, quia nos Deo nostro conjungimur, eam sciam quam tenetis, et tene- isse me, & tene- re significo, ut et anima una sit, et cor unum. Vig. 3. Epist. ad Amib. apud Lib. loc. cit.

<sup>p</sup> Melnebas Romanos qui hereticum sedere, nunquam passuri videbantur. Bell. loc. cit.

when time served to worke his feare, by his other publike and orthodoxall letters to *Iustinian*, *Theodora* and *Mennas*, hee did but cast a mist before their eyes, that they should not spy his heresie; and under that visor of a Catholike, he did labour to undermine the whole Catholike faith. And thus much in his private letter he signifieth to *Anthimus* and the rest, warning them first of secrecie, lest if his powder-plot should be discovered (as indeed most happily it was) the sudden blow should not hit the Councell of *Chalcedon*: and next, that besides their secrecie they should dissemble also no lesse than hee did, they should still seeme to suspect and bee jealous of him as of their onely enemy, that their feare might make Catholikes secure of him, and of that sudden blow which in a moment by the publishing of his Apostolike Edict for the adnulling of the Councell of *Chalcedon* he meant to give.

36. But *Bellarmino* for all this will prove by two reasons that *Vigilius* was not in heart an heretike, nor did *ex animo* write this Epistle. The former is, because, *non palam in ea condemnavit Catholicam fidem, sed occulte*; he did not openly and publicly, but onely in secret and closely condemne the Catholike faith: for hee writes therein, *Ut sint omnia occulta usque ad tempus*; that they should keepe all private untill a fitter time. Condemne then he did the Catholike faith, but not *ex animo*, because hee did secretly condemne it. *Ex studio occultandi*, saith *Gretzer*, by his desire of concealing it. *Bellarmino* collecteth this, that *Vigilius* did not seriously and from his heart, but dissemblingly write that impious Epistle. As if one may not doe the same thing *ex animo*, and seriously, and yet doe it secretly. What thinkes he of *Iudas*? his plotting to betray Christ was close and secret, his owne fellow Apostles knew not of it, but sayd, Master, is it I? his friendly conversing with Christ, sitting at table, and kissing, was open and publike, yet his outward courtesie, even his kisse was dissembled, and trecherous; his malice, treason, and murderous affection which were secret and covered under those outward shewes of love, were true and serious. The Powder-plotters dealt closely and secretly, all under boord: their pretended subjection was open, and yet the treason was serious, their obedience but fained. *Bellarmino* was but a meere novice in the Romane Court when hee writ this, and imagined that Popes doe not seriously that which they doe secretly.

37. His other reason to prove that *Vigilius* was not in heart hereticall, when he writ this Epistle, is, because he writ it not with an hereticall minde, *sed propter cupiditatem presidendi*, but in an ambitious desire of presidency. What I pray you, is an hereticall and ambitious minde incompatible? doth ambition exclude heresie? or in ambition for one to teach heresie, doth that hinder him from being in heart an heretike? Scarce was there any Heresiarch, whom ambition hath not inflamed, and who in ambition layd not the foundation of his heresie. *Valentinus*, sayth *Tertullian*, hoped for but missed a Bishopricke, in revenge thereof he kindled his heresie, and set fire in that Church, wherein himselfe could not be governour. When *Marcion*, (sayth *Epiphanius*) got not the presidency, he invented his heresie, and puffed up with pride, sayd,

*Ego*

q Oportet ut hac  
qua scribo nullus  
agnoscat. Epiph.  
Wig. apud Lib.

r Sed magis sa-  
spectum me ante  
alios, habeas sa-  
pientia vestra ut  
facilius possim  
que capi, operari  
et perficere. lb.

s Bell. lib. 4. de  
Pont. ca. 10.  
§ Sciendum.  
t Non fuit ani-  
mo hereticus.  
lbid.

u Gret. loc. cit.

x Bell. ubi supra.

y Tert. cont. Va-  
lent. ca. 4.

z Epiph. bar. 42



*Ego findam Ecclesiam, Ile rend afunder your Church.* When *Aerius*<sup>b</sup> mis-  
 fed the Bishopricke which *Eustathius* obtained, in his ambitious pride  
 he devised his heresie, *that a Presbyter was all one with a Bishop*. Heare  
 Cardinall *Bellarmines*<sup>c</sup> owne words: *All Arch-heretikes have one com-*  
*mon vice, and that is pride, they spring up in divers places, but pride is the*  
*mother of them all.* If *Vigilius* was no heretike in heart, because he was  
 ambitious, neither was *Nestorius*, nor *Arim*, nor *Aerius*, nor *Mon-*  
*tanus*, nor *Valentinus*, by *Bellarmines* divinity heretikes, because they  
 were all ambitious. If they notwithstanding their ambition were (as  
 certainly they were) Arch-heretikes, and taught their heresies with  
 hereticall minds, then not onely the Cardinals reason is inconsequent  
 and ridiculous, but *Vigilius* for all his ambition may not onely write  
 that Epistle with an hereticall minde, but be even an Heresiarch, or  
 rather a Pope heretike.

b Epiph. bar. 75.

c Bell. lib. de  
not. Eccl. ca. 13.

38. Againe, did he not write this with an hereticall minde? why  
 did not the Cardinall expresse what that hereticall minde is; which  
 was now wanting in *Vigilius*? An hereticall minde is no other but a  
 minde pertinaciously and obstinately addicted to heresie. It was he-  
 resie doubtlesse which he writ, in teaching with *Eutyches* but one na-  
 ture to be in Christ. That he writ this obstinately, is cleare, seeing he  
 writ it against the knowne judgement of the holy Councell of *Chalce-*  
*don*, that is, of the Catholike Church; which none can doe but even  
 thereby he shewes an obstinate and pertinacious minde, rebellious a-  
 gainst the Church. If this be not, no heretike in the world ever had  
 an hereticall minde. If *Arius*, *Nestorius*, and *Eutyches*, when they writ  
 or taught their doctrines with this minde, were hereticall and here-  
 tikes, then most certainly *Vigilius* who writ this Epistle with the like  
 obstinate and pertinacious minde, must needs bee judged to be rebel-  
 lious against the Church, and as heretically affected in minde, as *Ari-*  
*us* or *Eutyches* himselfe. Pride and insolency is so farte from excluding  
 an hereticall minde, as *Bellarmines* would here perswade, that it is even  
 an individuall companion, yea essentiall unto it. None can possibly  
 have an hereticall, but *co nomine* he hath an ambitious heart, the pride  
 whereof causeth him to condemne the just sentence of the Catholike  
 Church, and prefer before it his owne fancy and opinion.

39. You see now how inconsequent both these reasons of the Car-  
 dinals are, seeing *Vigilius* might bee hereticall in heart, though both  
 his writings were secret, and his minde ambitious. Let us yet a little  
 further debate this matter with the Cardinall. Say you that *Vigilius*  
 did not write this hereticall Epistle *ex animo*, or from his heart? I pray  
 you when looked your Cardinallship into the heart of *Vigilius*? how  
 know you that he was not an heretike in heart, when he was so hereti-  
 call in profession? or how know you of *S. Hildebrand*, of *Boniface* 8.  
 or of any of all the Popes that lived since their times, that they were  
 not heretikes and plaine Infidels in heart, when their words were Ca-  
 tholike? I would gladly for my learning be informed how *Bellarmines*,  
 or the most acute *Lynceus* of them all do or can know, otherwise than  
 by their outward professions, what any of all the Popes beleaved and  
 thought in their heart. What *Innocent* the third, when he decreed the

doctrine of Transubstantiation: what *Leo* the tenth, when he condemned *Luther*; or what *Paul*, *Innocent*, and *Pius* the fourth, when they confirmed their *Trent* Councells? How know you that in their hearts they beleaved those doctrines? or that they did not dissemble and faine, as you say *Vigilius* did? What can you say for *Pius* the fourth, which may not be sayd for *Vigilius* also? Doth *Pius* say, he did before, and now doth thinke as the *Trent* masters doe? Pope *Vigilius* sayth the like, and most plainly, *Eam fidem quam tenetis*, that faith which you (*Anthimus*, *Sewerus*, and *Theodosius*) doe hold, I signifie unto you, that I have held, and that I doe now hold the same. Doth *Pius* call the *Trent* Fathers his beloved brethren in Christ? so doth *Vigilius* call those hereticall Bishops his beloved brethren in Christ: nay in *Libertus* he calls them even Christs. Doth Pope *Pius* professe an unity betwixt himselfe and them, all making one body of the Church? Pope *Vigilius* doth the like, and he doth it more significantly: We, sayth he, preach this same doctrine that you doe, *Vi & anima una sit & cor unum in Deo*; so that there is in you and mee but one soule, and one heart in God. How can any speech be cordiall, if this testifying himselfe to be one soule and one heart with them, doe not come à *fibris*, but onely à *labriis*? Doth Pope *Pius* approve the doctrine of the *Trent* conspirators? So doth Pope *Vigilius* the doctrine of those *Eutychean* heretikes? Doth *Pius* condemne and anathematize *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, and all who thinke or teach otherwise than himselfe and his *Trent* Conventicle taught or beleaved? so doth Pope *Vigilius* condemne and anathematize all who deny two natures in Christ, all who beleave otherwise than himselfe and his *Eutychean* fellow heretikes did. In all these there is as much to be sayd for Pope *Vigilius*, as for Pope *Pius*: and if you please to adde that one other agreement also, as of *Vigilius* it is sayd, that they knew *crudelitatem fidei*; so may it in like manner bee truly sayd of Pope *Pius*, that this did manifest unto all men, *crudelitatem fidei*, the cruelty of his and his *Trent* Councels faith. If by these outward acts the Cardinall can know *Pius* the fourth to have *ex animo* condemned their *Trent* heresies, why can he not by the like outward acts know *Vigilius* to have *ex animo* condemned the Catholike faith? If *Vigilius* for all these outward acts, and so many testimonies and evidences of a willing minde did dissemble, and thinke in his heart otherwise than he writ, how will or can the Cardinall prove unto us that *Pius* the 4. and the whole Councell of *Trent* did not dissemble, and both write and speake otherwise than they thought in heart? Hath the Cardinall some windowes to pry into the secrets of the heart of *Pius* the fourth and the *Trent* Councell, which are dammed up that he cannot see into the brest of *Vigilius*? If Pope *Pius* upon his word and writing be to be credited, much more is Pope *Vigilius*, seeing he did not only by words and writing teach this hereticall doctrine, but (which *Pius* did not) he bound himselfe by a sacred oath that hee would teach the same. And which is yet a farre greater evidence, *Vigilius* after this did teach the like hereticall doctrine, to overthrow the same Conncell of *Chalcedon*, in the cause of the *Three Chapters*, which hee did so unfainedly and so cordially, that for teaching the same he incurred the just indignation

nation of the Emperour, the curse of the holy generall Councell, the publike hatred of all Catholikes, and, if wee may beleeve *Baronius*, even exile and persecution also. Why might not the same *Vigilius* from his heart teach *Eutychianisme*, as well as *Nestorianisme*? The faces of those two heresies looke contrary wayes indeed, but their tayles, like *Sampsons* Foxes, are joyned together to undermine the Catholike faith, and the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*: Hee who once is proved to be treacherous in this sort, and to doe this once from his heart, *semper praesumitur*, is alwayes to bee presumed treacherous in the same kinde: Hee who did this in the *Three Chapters*, would have done it in *Eutychianisme*, his heart, his desire, his purpose at both times was the same, the odds was accidental in the opportunity which served better in the one, than in the other; what need they excuse his teaching *Eutychianisme* to have been only labiall, when it is cleare his teaching of *Nestorianisme* was cordiall? If they cannot excuse Pope *Vigilius* for teaching *Nestorianisme* from his heart, which cannot possibly be done, what need they be so nice in denying his teaching of *Eutychianisme* to have come from the same heart? his fault in them both being alike, one answer will alike serve for them both.

44. But what, thinke you, meant the Cardinall so to busie himselfe, and bee so curious about the heart and secret minde of *Vigilius*? what though hee did not in heart, yet, *exteriori professione*, by his hereticall writing, by his outward confession, by that *Vigilius* condemned the Catholike faith, as the Cardinall<sup>d</sup> acknowledgeth, & it is the Popes outward profession, not his inward cogitation, by which wee prove his Chayre to bee fallible; what have wee, nay what hath the Cardinall or any of them all to doe with *Vigilius* intent or inward thoughts? leave those to his Tribunall, who onely knoweth and seeth the hearts of all the sonnes of men; let men, who cannot see the heart, looke to his words, to his writings, to that profession, by which hee teacheth others. If that be hereticall, what boots it them though his heart bee orthodoxall? *Confirma fratres, & pasce oves*, are outward aets, they looke abroad and outwardly, not to the inward and hidden man in the Popes breast. If he think as *Simon Peter*, and teach as *Simō Magnus*, as *Arius*, *Nestorius*, or *Eutyches* did, is he not an hereticall teacher, an hereticall Pope, a confirmer of his brethre in heresie, a feeder, nay, a very prisoner of the sheepe, with worse weeds than the Socraticall Cicuta? If the Pope onely thinke and beleeve heresie, why, thought is free, (to wit, from mans eye, much more from his censure) his thought is for himselfe; that error is personall, it hurts none but the Pope himselfe. If either by word or writing hee teach heresie, that is Pontificall, it is the fault of his office, of his Chayre, which should have beene infallible, this hurts his sheepe and his brethren: Nor skilleth it at all in what manner, whether by word or writing, by what occasion or motive hee teacheth heresie, but whether at all, or upon any occasion hee wittingly and willingly teach it, that is the onely point which is questioned. *Vigilius* condemned the Catholike faith, saith Cardinall *Bellarmino*<sup>e</sup>, but hee did it for ambition, and desire of presidency. Bee it so: If the Pope for ambition

<sup>d</sup> Dico *Vigilius*  
scripsisse illam  
Epistolam, et  
damnasse Catho-  
licam fidem, sal-  
tem exteriori  
professione. Bell.  
lib. 4. de Pont.  
ca. 10. §. Respon-  
deo, multi.  
c Reg. 8. 39.

<sup>e</sup> Bell. loco cit.



may condemne the Catholike faith, why may hee not doe so, for feare of exile, of disgrace, of losing the Emperours, or the King of Spaine, or the French Kings favour? If for feare, why not for favour to purchase the good will of those, or any of them? If for favour, why not for hatred, hatred of *Henrie* the fourth, the Emperour, of *Henry* the eighth, for pulling away the best feather out of the Popes Plume, of *Luther* for being so busie in meddling with his Indulgences, and the triple Crowne? If for hatred or favour, why not for desire of lucre, and to keepe the gaine of their crafts-men and Image workers, who continually sing that note in the Popes eare, Great is *Diana* of the Ephesians, great is the Church and *S. Peters* Chayre? Why not for any like passion of the minde may the Pope condemne the Catholike faith? On what a ticklish and slippery ground dorch their whole faith stand, when either the Popes ambition, or feare, or favour, or love, or hatred, or anger, or desire, or a fit of any other perturbation, which disturbeth his minde, may procure, as at this time it did in *Vigilius*, an anathema to the Catholike faith? Best it were for them to renew the Stoicall sect and doctrine, and receive it in the Church, that out of those sober and unmoved mindes, as out of an happy Nursery of Popes, the Cardinals might in the Conclave still elect a Pope voyde of all passions and perturbations, and transplant him out of the Stoicall to their *Apostolicall Chaire*. But sure, so long as they goe no further than the Conclave, they shall never finde any but of the same metall with *Vigilius*, one that may bee tossed every way with ambition, with envy, with love, with hatred, with feare, and every passion of his minde, as a powder-plot to blow up the whole Catholike faith, and when he hath done that by his words, by his writing, by his preaching and teaching, by any of his outward acts whatsoever, Cardinall *Bellarmino* can excuse it, and wipe away all the disgrace of it, as here hee doth in *Vigilius*; hee did it not with an hereticall minde, for hee did it for ambition, hee did it for feare, hee did it for hatred, hee did it for some other passion, hee did it onely by an exterior act, and not *ex animo*. But in the meane time whether hee did it *ex animo*, or otherwise by his exterior act, the Catholike faith is blowne up from the foundation thereof, as much by the Popes act, as by the act of *Arius*, of *Nestorius*, of *Eutyches*, or any other heretike; and the Church hath a goodly amends, indeed, that the Pope forsooth did not (which is impossible for him or all heretikes in the world to doe) blow it up with an imagination or inward thought, but with an exterior act of his teaching by word or writing.

*℞ Bell. loc. cit.*

41. Oh but, sayth *Bellarmino*, *non damnavit fidem palam, sed occulte*, *Vigilius* did not openly but closely condemne the Catholike faith: Closely, so he did indeed; it was his purpose and intent so to doe. He came not now as *Nero*, or *Dioclesian*, with open force to batter, but as *Simon Magus*, *Arius*, *Nestorius*, *Eutyches*, and other heretikes, with *Synomiah* arts, to undermine the Church; all his worke was under the vauit. The Anathema denounced in this Epistle against all who hold two natures in Christ, was the powder that should have blowne up the holy Synod, and Senate, the House of God, and whole City of God:

The

the powder, the person and all was ready, onely, which the Cardinall observes, the time for the open publishing of that Anathema, and setting fire to the traine was not yet come. The gracious Providence of God, which watcheth over Israell, the admirable zeale, piety, prudence, and vigilancy, which God put into the heart of *Iustinian*, the constancy of faith in the Greeke Church, which at that time most happily fell out to bee greater than at any time before or since; by these was the fatal blow intended by *Vigilius*, most happily prevented. This close and secret working proves Pope *Vigilius* to have bene both subtil and malicious in condemning the faith; it doth excuse him neither *à toto*, nor *tamq*, from his condemning the faith or from being an hereticall Pope, labouring by his hereticall doctrine to subvert the faith.

*g Vi sint omnia  
occulta, usque ad  
tempus. Bell. loc.  
cit.*

42. The fourth and last Evasion or excuse for *Vigilius* said in writing this Epistle, is *Bellarmines* also; *Vigilius*, saith hee, did not at that time define any thing against the faith, *tamquam Pontifex*, as hee was Pope. What shuffling and shifting is this in the Cardinall? hee did not define any thing against the faith, as Pope: Hee did then define that which was against the faith, but hee defined it not as Pope, for otherwise it had bene foolish to say, he defined it not as Pope, when hee defined it, neither as Pope, nor as no Pope, when hee defined it not at all. Againe, what a worthy saying is this of a Cardinall? *Vigilius* did not at that time define it as hee was Pope; at that time, to wit, while *Silvester* lived and was the onely Pope, at which time, as himselfe in expresse words saith, *Vigilius Papa non erat*, *Vigilius was not then the Pope*. What needed the Cardinall say hee defined it not at that time as hee was Pope, when at that time he was not Pope? This reduplication, *quatenus Papa*, implies hee was Pope, and that being Pope hee defined it, but hee defined it not as hee was Pope, but as hee was a private man, or some other way: Would not the Cardinall laugh, if *Greizer* or any such good friend of his should say, *Bellarmines* at that time while hee was at *Ingolstadt* writ not his Controversies as he was Pope, or, hee writ them not as he was a Turke, a Jew, or Mahometane? But leaving these shifts, which demonstrate plainly, that *Bellarmines* had a desire to say somewhat in excuse of *Vigilius*, but knew not what, and therefore snatched at this or that, or any thing, though it were never so croasse unto himselfe, and such also as he could not hold. Let us consider the Exception it selfe; *Vigilius* writ this Epistle, that is confessed; hee writ it when hee was the onely true and lawfull Pope; that wee have proved; hee defined heresie in it, and that which is against the faith, that *Bellarmines* implyeth; hee condemned in it the Catholike faith, that *Bellarmines* in plaine words expresseth. Thus far the cause is cleare. Now whether Pope *Vigilius* in it defined heresie, and condemned the Catholike faith, as he was Pope, or no; that is the point here to be debated.

43. Some may thinke, that *Bellarmines* by those two reasons drawne from secrecie and an ambitious minde, by which he laboured before, to prove, that *Vigilius* did not condemne the faith *ex animo*, meant also that he condemned it not as Pope, for it followeth in the

*h Bell. 4. de Pñt.  
ca. 10. § Sciendū*

1 Grex, loc. cit.

next sentence, *siquidem Epistolam scripsit*, as giving a reason of his saying. If any like to take Bellar. words in that sort, then his reasons are before hand refuted, for as *Vigilius* might, *ex animo*, write heretically, both privately and out of ambition, so also might hee, *tanquam Pontifex*, condemne the faith, notwithstanding both his secrecy and ambitious mind, secrecy and an ambitious mind are no more repugnant to the one, than to the other, they are compatible with them both; the Pope may use his *Apostolicall* authority, in teaching, as wel privately as publicly, as well with *Indae* in ambition, as with *John* or *Peter* in sincerity of heart. But the Cardinals Apologist, who it may be consulted with the Cardinall about his intent herein, doth ease us of those reasons, for hee tells us plainly, that from *Vigilius* his desire of secrecie, *nil aliud colligit*, *Bellarmino* collectes or proves nothing else, but this, that *Vigilius* did not write his letter from his heart or *serio*, that hee did it not in earnest. It is but a sport with *Grex*, or with the Pope, to condemne the Catholike faith; they doe it, but they doe it not in earnest, they doe it *joculariter* not *serio*. Have ye indeed such May-games & sports at *Rome*, as to condemne the faith, and then say, I was in jest, and in sport? Are not these men new Philistines, Call in *Sampson*, Condemne the Catholike faith, to make us pastime? But let us leave them to their sports, till the fall of their Babylonish house make a catastrophe and dolefull end both of their actors & spectators: That which I now note, is, that *Bellarmino* doth not in those words, *siquidem Epistolam scripsit*, &c. from the privatenesse or secrecy prove any thing else, but that *Vigilius* writ it not *serio*, in earnest and from his heart; that hee writ it not, *tanquam Pontifex*, this those words prove not, *Bellarmino* in those words collectes not: So we have now nothing but the bare saying of *Bellarmino*, without any prooffe, without any reasons, and I must needs confesse, I hold it a most sufficient encounter for any man to *Bellarmino ipse dixit*, to oppose, *ipse dico*, yet because I desire rather to satisfie such as seeke the truth, then contend with those who seeke to smother and betray the truth, I will a little further enlarge this point, and see if it may be cleared by evidence of reason, that Pope *Vigilius* did not onely condemne the Catholike faith at that time, but that he did it even as hee was Pope, and, *tanquam Pontifex*, condemne the Catholike faith.

44. What it is for a Pope to teach an error as Pope, may be perceived by other Arts and Sciences, in the practice or exercise whereof, together with knowledge, judgement, and skill, fidelity also is required; were *Baronius* or some *Romane Facundus* to examine this point, they would quickly sute the Pope to some Cobler, Pedler, or such like companion: I love not to deale so rudely with his Holinesse, yet if I should happen at any time to let slip a word that way, you know how the Cardinall quitted the religious Emperour with, *Ne ultra crepidam*. If a Physitian, or Lawyer, or Iudge in any discourse should speake barbarously or incongruously, they erre therein but as *Grammarians*, not as Iudges, Lawyers, or Physitians, But if a Iudge for any sinister respect should pronounce that sentence as just, which is against the law, or if a Lawyer should after his diligent sifting of the



the cauſe, affirming that title to bee ſound, which were clearly void in law; or if a Phyſitian ſhould preſcribe to his patient *Coloquintida* for an wholeſome diet, each of them now err'd & offend'd in his owne profeſſion, & in that proper duty which belongeth to them; the Iudge as a Iudge, the Counſellor as a Counſellor, the Phyſitian as a Phyſitian; becauſe they fail'd either in ſkill or in fidelity in thoſe faculties wherein they profeſſe both to know themſelves, and to make knowe unto others what is right and good: If in other matters they tranſgreſſe, it is not *quatenus ſales*, if any of them bee prophane, covetous, or intemperate, they offend now *quatenus homines*, as they are mortall men in thoſe duties of morality, which are common to them with all men: If they bee ſeditious, rebellious, and conſpire in reaſonable practice, they offend *quatenus Cives*, as they are parts of the Common-wealth; in thoſe duties which are common to them with all ſubjects; but when they offend in Phyſick, law, or judgment, thoſe are their owne peculiar Arts and Sciences, they then offend neither *quatenus homines* nor *quatenus Cives*, nor in any other reſpect but *quatenus ſales*, as they are ſuch profeſſors: for now they tranſgreſſe againſt thoſe proper duties, which, as they are Iudges, Counſellors, or Phyſicians, are required of them. The like of all Artificers, of Grāmarians, Logicians, Poets, Philoſophers, of Preſbyters, of Biſhops, of the Profeſſors of Theology, which is *ſcientia ſcientiarum*, is to bee ſaid. If a Divine ſhall ſpeake rudely, incongruouſly, *ad populum Antiochenum*, he offend's as a Grammarian, not as a Divine, unleſſe perhaps it bee no fault when it doth ſo happen for edification, that hee ought ſo to ſpeake, as Saint *Auſten*<sup>k</sup> did uſe divers barbariſmes, and ſay, *offum* for *os*, *ſloriet* for *ſlorabit*, *dolus* for *dolor*, *Mala me populus*, I had rather edifie with rudeneſſe of words than ſpeake nothing but pure Ciceroſian without edifying them, without honouring God; But if a Biſhop or any Divine, in ſtead of truth teach hereſie, either becauſe hee knowes not the truth, or knowing it, oppugnes the truth, hee is now in his owne element, he offend's no longer as a Rhetorician, or Grammarian, but, *quatenus talis*, as hee is a Biſhop, as hee is a Divine, as hee is one who both ſhould know, and bring others to the knowledge of the truth. And this, beſide that by reaſon it is evident, is grounded on that ſaying of *Auſten*<sup>l</sup>, *Aliter ſervit Rex qua homo, aliter qua Rex*, for as a King ſerveth God, *qua Rex*, in doing that which none but a King can doe; ſo a King, or a Biſhop, or any other offendeth God, as a King, or Biſhop, in doing againſt that duty which none but they are to doe.

45. Now, what is ſaid of all Sciences, Arts and myſteries, that is in due proportion to be applyed to that greateſt myſterie of myſteries, and Craft above all Crafts, to their Pope-craft, or myſterie of Inquiry: He is the ſheepheard to feed all, the Phyſitian to cure all, the Counſellor to adviſe all, the Iudge to decide al, the Monarke to command all, hee is all in all, nay, above all; hard it is to define him or his duties, hee is indefinite, infinite, transcendent above all limits, above all definitions, above all rule, yea, above all reaſon alſo: But as the Nymphs not able to meaſure the vaſtneſſe of the Gyants whole body, meaſured onely the compaſſe of his thumbe with a thred, and by it

knew

k Auſt. lib. 4. de  
doct. Chriſt. ca.  
16. et Tract. 7.  
in Ioban.

l Aug. Epiſt. 16:

knew and admired the bignesse of his Gygantean body, so let us consider but the thumbe, or little toe of his Holinesse fault, and by it conjecture the immanity of his cruelle kinne of *Anak. Pasce oves & confirma fratres*, must be ed as the Nymphes thred or linc, for these two are the Popes peculiar, in which are contained all the rest, and they reach as farre as heaven and hell, they are the Popes duty, *quatenus* hee is Pope. If at any time, or upon any occasion hee swarve from this line, if by his doctrine he call downe his brethren, instead of confirming them, or give them poyson in stead of good food, he offends not now as Swines Inke, nor as Peter of Tarentasia, nor as Hugh Bone companion, but *quatenus* Pope, even as Pope, in that very Pastorall and Papall duty, which properly and peculiarly belongeth to him as Pope. Lay now this line and thred to Pope *Vigilius*, and his Epistle, did he confirme *Ambrusius*, *Theodosius*, and *Severus* in the faith, when he told them, that by Gods helpe both before and then also he held the same faith with them, and that was Eutycheanisme, and that they were joynd to him in the charity which is in Christ? or was this whollome food, which hee, the great Pastor of their soules, set before them: Accursed be all that deny one and affirme two natures to have beene in Christ? If this bee hereticall doctrine, seeing Pope *Vigilius* fed them, and confirmed them in this faith, then certainly he taught heresie as Pope; that is, hee exercised his Papall office, even that of feeding and confirming his brethren, which is peculiar to the Pope, as Pope, to the teaching and approving of heresie at this time.

46. If yet wee shall goe somewhat more precisely and exactly to worke, according to line and measure, those acts of feeding and confirming doe but in a very equivocal sense (for their doctrine is full of Equivocation) agree to other Bishops, but still a maine difference or odds is to be observed, betwixt the Popes feeding and confirming, as hee is Pope, and all others, when any other Bishop teacheth heresie, because his teaching is subordinate and fallible, one may, nay, he must doubt or feare to feed on such food, he must still receive it with this caution or *tacit* appeale of his heart, if his holinesse commend it for an wholesome diet of the soule. But if the Pope teach any heresie, if hee say that the Sunne is darke, the left, the write hand, poyson an wholesome food, Eutycheanisme or Nestorianisme, the orthodoxall faith, here, because there is no higher judge to whom you may appeale, you are bound upon salvation, without any doubt or scruple at all, to eate and devoure this meate; you may not judge, nay, you may not dispute or aske any man whether it be true or no, the Popes teaching is supreme, and therefore infallible, indubitable, this is to teach, to feed, to confirme as Pope, for none can thus teach or feed, but onely the Pope as Pope. So the same hereticall doctrine, when it is taught by the Pope, as he is a private man, is a private instruction without any publike authority to teach; when by him, as a Presbiter, it is an instruction with publike authority to teach, but without judicatory power to censure the gainayers; when by him, as a Bishop, it is both with pulike authority and judicatory power to censure, suspend, or excommunicate the gainayers, but yet subordinate and fallible, including

in Sunt qui Ser-  
gium 2. prius di-  
cant os porci vo-  
catum, et ob tur-  
pitudinem cogno-  
menti, Sergi no-  
men sumpsisse,  
eandem consuetu-  
dinem ad poste-  
ros mansisse, &c.  
Plat. in vita  
Serg. 2.  
n Dicimus qui-  
dem quod Inno-  
centius hoc dix-  
it, non ut Papa,  
sed ut Petrus  
de Tarentasia.  
In Extrav. Jo-  
han. 22. Tit. 14.  
de verbor. signif.  
ca. 5.  
Greg. 13. antea  
Hugo dictus à  
Boncompagni  
familia origi-  
nus. Anto. Cicar.  
in ejus vita.  
o Vigil. in epist.  
apud Liber. loc.  
cit.

sling a virtuall appeale to the highest tribunall of the Pope, when by him, as Pope, it hath all the former conditions, both publike authority to teach, and iudiciall power to censure, and which is the Popes peculiar prerogative, as Pope, to doe those with infallibility of judgement, and *supremacy* of authority, such as none may refuſe, or doubt to beleeeve and embrace.

If any will here reply with the Sophister *Thrasymachus* his subtilty in *Plato*, that the Pope, as Pope, teacheth not amisse, but as hee faileth in the Popes duty, as hee wanteskill or will to performe that officer. This must bee acknowledged as true indeed, for in the strictest sense of all, what the Pope is as Pope, that must inseparably agree to every Pope, and the manner of his teaching as Pope, must inseparably agree to the teaching of every Pope, even as Logicians say, that what agreeth to a man, a bird, or a tree, *quatenus talia*, as they are such, must agree to every man, bird and tree. But this quirk and subtilty will not helpe their cause, nor excuse the Pope from erring as Pope, for as in this sense no Pope, as Pope, doth erre, because then every Pope should erre in all doctrines which hee teacheth, so neither in the same sense doth any Pope, as Pope, teach the truth, for then every doctrine of every Pope should bee true. Again, as according to this sense, no Pope as Pope, so no Bishop as Bishop, no Presbyter as Presbyter doth erre or teach heresie, for did hee in his teaching erre as Bishop or Presbyter, then every Presbyter and every Bishop, and so even the Apostles themselves should erre in their teaching. But as *Vigilius* or *Liberius* when they taught *Arianisme*, *Eutychianisme*, or *Nestorianisme*, did this not simply as Popes, but as persons not knowing as in duty they should, what to teach, or knowing it, but willingly teaching the contrary to their knowledge, which in duty they should not: even so *Nestorius*, *Macedonius*, *Arius*, and *Eutyches*, every Bishop, and Presbyter, when they erred, they erred not simply as Bishops, or as Presbyters, but as persons failing in their Episcopall, or Presbyteriall duties, either not knowing the truth, as by their office they should, or wilfully oppugning and contradicting the truth, as by their office they should not: So by his subtilty, if any applaud themselves in it, not only the Bishops of *Rome*, but of *Constantinople*, of *Antioch*, of *Alexandria*, yea, all Bishops and Presbyters in the world shall be as free from error, as his holinesse himselfe, yea, all professors of any Art, Science, or faculty, shall plead the like Papall exemption from error, every man shall bee a Pope in his owne faculty, no Grammarian speaking incongruously as a Grammarian, but as wanting the skil required in a Grammarian, no Iudge giving a wrongfull sentence as a Iudge, no Galenist ministring unwholsome phylicke as a Physitian, no Artificer working any thing amisse in his trade, as an Artificer, but as being defective in the duties either of that knowledge, or of that fidelity which is required in a Iudge, a Physitian, and in every Artificer. If they will exempt all Bishops and Presbyters, all Iudges and Physitians from erring, as they are such Officers or Artificers, we also will in the same sort and sense allow the like immunity to the Pope: If they notwithstanding this subtilty, will admit another Bi-

shop

q Plat. lib. 1. de  
Repub.

q Per hanc conditionem quatenus ipsam, notatur quod predicatum inest subiecto secundum propriam subiecti naturam. Iac. Zab. com. in ca. 4. lib. demon. text. 36.



shop to erre as Bishop, they must not thinke much if wee exempt nor the Pope as Pope. For, to speake that which is the very truth of them all, and exactly to measure every thing by his owne line, a Iudge simply as Iudge, doth pronounce a judiciall sentence, as a skilfull and faithfull Iudge, an upright judiciall sentence; as an unskilfull or unfaithfull Iudge, an erronious or unjust sentence. A Bishop or Presbyter simply as Bishop or Presbyter, doth teach with publike authority in the Church; as a skilfull and faithfull Bishop or Presbyter he teacheth the truth of God; as an ignorant and unfaithfull Bishop he teacheth errors and heresies in the Church; the one without, the other with judicall power to censure the gainsayers. The like in all Arts, Sciences, and faculties is to be sayd; even in the Pope himselfe. A Pope simply as he is Pope and defined by them, teacheth both with authority to teach, with power to censure the gainsayers, and with a supremacy of judgement binding all to embrace his doctrine without appeale, without doubt, as an *infallible* Oracle: as a skilfull or faithfull Pope he teacheth the truth in that sort, as an unskilfull or unfaithfull Pope he teacheth error or heresie with the like authority, power, and supremacy; binding others to receive and swallow up his heresies for Catholike truth, and that with a most blind obedience, without once doubting of the same.

48. Apply this to *Vigilius* & his hereticall Epistle: In a vulgar sense, *Vig.* erred as Pope, because he erred in those very Pontifical duties of feeding & confirming, w<sup>ch</sup> are proper to his office. In a strickt sense, though hee did not therein erre simply as Pope, but *quatenus talis* taught onely with a supreme binding authority, yet hee erred as an unfaithfull Pope, binding others by that his Pontifical and supreme authority to receive *Eutychianisme* as Catholike truth, without once moving any doubt or making scruple of the same. What may wee thinke will they oppose to this; If they say *Vigilius* doth not expresse in this Epistle, that hee writ it by his *Apostolicall* authority. Hee doth not indeed. Nor doth Pope *Leo* in that Epistle to *Flavianus*, against the heresie of *Eutyches*, which to have beene writ by his *Apostolicall* authority, and as he was Pope none of them doe or will deny; that Epistle being approved by the whole Councell of *Chalcedon*. Pope *Leo* by his Papall authority condemneth *Eutychianisme*, Pope *Vigilius* by his Papall authority confirmeth *Eutychianisme*: both of them confirmed their doctrine by their Papall authority; both writ as Popes, the one as *orthodoxall*, the other as a perfidious and hereticall Pope; neither of both expresse that their *Apostolicall* authority by which they both writ. The like in many other Epistles of *Leo*, and of other Popes might easily bee observed. Nor the tenth part of their decretal Epistles, such as they writ as Popes, have this clause of doing it by their *Apostolicall* authority expressed in them. It is sufficient that this is virtually in them all, and virtually it is in this of Pope *Vigilius*: Yea, but hee taught this onely in a private letter to a few, to *Anthimus*, *Severus* and *Theodosius*, not in a publike, generall, and encyclicall Epistle, written for instruction of the whole Church. What, is the Pope fallible in teaching of a few, in confirming three of his brethren?

why

why not in foure, in eight, in twenty? and if in twenty, why not in an hundred? if so, why not in a thousand? if in one, why not in two, foure, or ten thousand? *Candax pilos ut equina paulatim vellam*; where, or at what number shall we stay, as being the least which with infallibility he can teach? Certainly, *confirma fratres, & in cathedra sede, & pascere*, respects two as well as two millions. If in confirming or feeding three, the Chaire may bee erroneous, how can wee know to what number God hath tyed the infallibility of it? But the sixth generall Councell may teach them a better lesson. Pope *Honorius* writ an hereticall Epistle but onely to *Sergius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, *Vigilius* writ this to three, all of patriarchall dignity as *Sergius* was. *Honorius* writ it privately, as *Vigilius* did, which was the cause, as it seemes, that the *Romane Church* tooke so little notice thereof: yet though it was private, and but to one, it is condemned by the sixth Councell, for a domaticall writing of Pope *Honorius*, for a writing wherein hee confirms others in heresie: and Pope *Leo* the second judged it to bee such as was a blemish to the *Apostolike See*, such as by which *Honorius* did labour to subvert the Catholike faith. The like and more danger was in this, to these three deposed patriarchs. It confirmed them in heresie; it confirmed the Emperesse; it confirmed all that tooke part with them; it was the meanes whereby the faith was in hazard to have beene utterly subverted. For plurality or paucity it is not materiall, be they few, be they moe: if the Pope as Pope, or as an hereticall pope may confirme three, or but one, that one is abundant to prove his Chaire and judicall sentence not to be infallible.

¶ *Que recitatur Conc. 6. A.D. 12. pa. 64.*

¶ *Vocantur ista et alia Epistole dogmatica scripta. In eodem Conc. A.D. 12. p. 65. a. et retrahentes dogmaticas Epistolas a Sergio, et ab Honorio ad Sergium. A.D. 13. pa. 67. a. et, Honorius impia dogmata confirmavit. Ibid.*

¶ *Anathematizamus quoque Honorium, qui hanc Apostolicam Ecclesiam, et immaculatam fidem prophana prodicione subvertere conatus est. Leo 2. Epist. x. Pontifex non ut præsens Concilio, sed ut Princeps Ecclesie summus potest iudicium Concilii retractare. Et c. Bell. lib. 2. de Conc. ca. 18. § Dico secundo. y Agapeti Papa contra Anthimus iudicium absque Synodo fuisse secundum supremam Apostolicam seculi auctoritatem, qui supra omnes Canones Pontifex emittit. Bar. an. 554. nu. 3.*

49. But he taught this alone, not in a Councell, not with advice of his Cardinals, and Consistory: why, he did it not as a member of a Councell, but as *Princeps Ecclesie*. He did this as did *Agapetus* in deposing *Anthimus*, above and besides the Canons. The whole power of his *Apostolike* authority much shined in this decision, more than in any other, where either his Cardinals or a Councell hath ought to doe: much more was this done by him as Pope, than any of them. And yet had he listed to follow the judgement of others, or of a Synod herein, what better direction, advice, or counsell, could his Cardinals, or any Synod in the world give unto him, than the decree of the whole Councell of *Chalcedon*? That *Vigilius* had before his eyes at this time, that was in stead of a thousand Cardinals unto him, seeing he as *Ecclesie Princeps*, defined *Eutycheanisme*, notwithstanding that most holy and generall Synod; yea against that Synod, what could the advice of another, or of a few Cardinals have avayled at this time?

50. Thus all the evasions which they use, being refuted, it may now be clearly concluded, not onely that *Vigilius* writ this impious and hereticall Epistle, and writ it when he was the true and lawfull Pope; but that he writ it also *ex animo*, even out of an hereticall heart, and writ it as he was Pope, that is, in such sort as that by his Pontificall and supreme authority hee confirmed that heresie which hee taught therein. And this is the former of his Acts, which as I told you is very remarkable, his purpose and intent therein being the overthrow of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, and of the whole Catholike faith.

51. The other act of *Vigilius* concernes the cause of the three Chapters, wherein by the heresie of *Nestorine*, he publicly decreed and performed that (as much as in him lay, and as by his Apostolicall decree could be effected,) which hee had purposed and intended to doe by the heresie of *Eutychianisme*. In which whole cause, how *Vigilius* from the first to the last, behaved himselfe; how at the first hee oppugned the Emperours most religious Edict, and the Catholike faith; how afterward he played the dissembling *Prætor* with the Emperour and the whole Church, for the space of five or six yeares together; how at the last he returned to his naturall and habituall love of heresie, and how in decreeing it by the fulnesse of his Apostolicall authority, hee sought utterly and for ever to abolish the Council of *Chalcedon*, and with it the whole Catholike faith; the former Treatise doth abundantly declare; which withall demonstrates the vanity of that saying of *Bellarmino*: For the time, sayth he<sup>a</sup>, that hee was true Pope, neither any error, nor simulation of error was found in him: sed summa constantia in fide, but the greatest constancy of faith that could be. For as by our former treatise is evident, he was not only most wavering, but hereticall in faith. And this was in a manner the whole course of *Vigilius* life, or the most eminent acts thereof while he was Pope; pretending orthodoxy, but embracing heresie, and as opportunity offered it selfe, labouring by words, by private Epistles, by resisting the imperiall, just, and godly Edict, by publike constitutions to overthrow the faith and the whole Church of God.

52. You see now his ingresse into the Papacy, and his progresse in the same: touching his egress both out of it and this life, heare what *S. Liberatus*<sup>b</sup> saith: How *Vigilius* being by heresie afflicted, died, it is knowne unto all. Heare what Cardinall *Bellarmino*<sup>c</sup> saith out of *Liberatus*, *Ab illa ipsa hæresi afflictus, Vigilius was miserably afflicted by that selfe same heresie*, which at the first he nourished: and againe; *Misere vexatus usque ad mortem*, he was miserably vexed even untill hee dyed. Heare *Baronius*, who first promised<sup>d</sup> to declare how *invigilavit in Vigiliis vindicta Dei*; how the vengeance of God watched *Vigilius*, and at last revenged the innocent blood which he stied: and then performing that promise, sayth<sup>e</sup>, He died in an Iland in Sicily by the just judgement of God; *confectus ipse arumnis ex morbo*, himselfe being wasted with misery, by reason of his disease, who had caused *Silverius* in an Iland in *Palmaria* to be pined away, and put to death. As he got the papacy by wicked meanes, so was he *immensis agitat us fluctibus*, tossed with exceeding great tempests therein, hated by the Emperour, not gratefull to the Easterne, and execrable to the Westerne Bishops: and when hee seemed to have come out of the streame into the haven, and almost one foot into the City, being pined away; *immensis doloribus*, with unmeasurable paines, he dyed. Thus *Baronius*. Now if we should deale with him as *Baronius*<sup>e</sup> doth with *Iustinian*, and by his precedent acts judge of his reward, according to the Text, *Opera eorum sequuntur eos*, I feare the censure would seeme very harsh to those who are so ready to examine *Iustinian* by that rule. For what workes I pray you followed Pope *Vigilius*? Ambition, usurpation, sacriledge, murder, symony, hypocrisie, schisme, heresie, and Antichristianisme;

<sup>a</sup> Bell. lib. 4. de Pont. ca. 10.  
<sup>b</sup> Contigit. Ab hoc tempore nullus inventus est in *Vigilio*, aut error, aut erroris simulatio, &c.

<sup>b</sup> Liber. Brev. ca. 22.  
<sup>c</sup> Bell. loc. cit.

<sup>d</sup> Bar. an. 538. an. 20.

<sup>e</sup> Bar. an. 556. an. 1.

<sup>f</sup> Opinari si cui licet, facilius est invenire, qui E. vagry de ejus condemnatione (ad supplicia a. pad inferas luen. de) odit legi sententiam quam aliorum. Bar. an. 565. an. 1. & 6.



christianisme, concerning which the Apostle sayth, *They which doe them shall not inherit the kingdome of God.* I will not, I list not be rigorous in this point, neither towards him or any other. I content my selfe with that lesson of the Apostles, *Domino suo stat aut cadit.* Yet thus much by occasion of this Treatise, and the approved judgement of the Church declared therein concerning *Theodorus of Mopsuestia* long before dead, must needs bee said of him, of *Baronius*, and of all other who have already, or shall at any time hereafter write as they have done, in defence of heresie, and oppugnation of Gods truth. As repentance for such sinnes and impious writings opens unto them, so impenitency and persevering therein, eternally shuts against them the gates of Gods mercy, and the kingdome of heaven. Both w<sup>ch</sup> because they are hid from mans eyes, the Church leaving the judgement of certainty and verity onely to God, passeth her sentence which is the judgement of charity, by the outward and apparant acts which are open unto them: whomsoever shee seeth not, nor findes by certaine and evident prooffe to have manifested the detestation and revocation of their hereticall and impious writings, which before they published and maintained, all those though dead ten, an hundred, or a thousand years before, she by her censure doth, and doth most justly condemne, accurse, and anathematize, as by her sentence against *Theodorus of Mopsuestia*, dead an hundred yeares before, is most evident, whose condemnation and anathema pronounced by the fift Councell, is approved by all succeeding generall Councels, by all Catholikes, and even by the whole Catholike Church. Nor will I here dispute whether such a sentence doth not sometimes passe, *errante clavis*, the party having repented, whom they not having prooffe of his repentance, thought to dye impenitent; but howsoever that fall out, none may justly complaine of the Churches judgement as unjust or unequall herein; for besides that it is presumed, that those who so notoriously and publicly by their hereticall writings doe scandalize the Church and people of God, if they had seriously repented would have expressed some publike and outward testimony of the same; the Church would by this severity of her censure, teach all men a lesson which is very hard to learne; first, that they should not have such an itch and ambitious desire to write or utter those detestable heresies which lurk within their breasts; or if they cannot observe that, yet at least to learne to be so lowly and humble in heart; as to revoke their impieties and blasphemies, although to some blemish and disgrace of themselves, yet to the great honour of Gods truth, and the satisfaction and edification of the holy Church, which they had scandalized. If in ambition they will first oppugne the truth; and then in a worse pride of heart, not be reclaimed to the truth; nor shew their love unto it, why should not the Church by her most charitable judgement shew her open detestation of their persons, who in the insolency of their hearts will not shew any open detestation of their heresies? That *Vigilius* writ a papall Constitution in defence of heresie, it is apparent and undeniable: that he at any time revoked that writing, I wish it were, but it is not yet evident. The like may be sayd of *Baronius*, of *Pighius*, of

*Eccius*, of the *Laterane*, *Florentine*, and *Trent* conspirators, of all who have whet their tongues against other truth, and specially to uphold that fundamentall heresie of the Popes infallibility. Their writings for heresie are evident, that they ever reclaimed those writings, it is inevident: and if ever they and their cause come to bee tryed, in such a free, lawfull, and oecumenicall Councell as was this fift under *Iustinian*, they may justly feare, and certainly expect from the Church, (unlesse the disclaming of their writings may by certaine prooffe be made knowne) the very like sentence, though a hundred yeares after theirs, as passed upon *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia* an hundred yeares after his death. And because the houre-glasse for repentance is runne out to the former, all that we can doe, is (which I seriously now doe from my heart) to cry amaine unto others, to admonish, exhort, yea even pray and entreat them by the mercies of God, and by the love of their owne soules, first that they keepe their tongues and pennes from once uttering any heresie; or (if they have not done that) with the same hands to give the medicine, wherewith they gave the wound, and as openly; nay much more openly to disclame than they have ever proclaimed their impious and hereticall doctrines.

53. You have now some view both of the life and death of *Vigilius*. The exact pourtraiture of the Popes lives, *Baronius* had beene able to set forth if he had listid; but he addeth such *fucos*, and so many sophisticall colours, that indeed scarce you shall see any one of them in his Annals set out in his native and naturall habit. If ought be amisse in this our description, and not set forth according to the lively lineaments of *Vigilius* and his impieties, the equall reader will not too rigorously censure the same. I acknowledge that I can but *dolere* in this kinde; to polish and set forth the lively image of their Popes, I have not learned: That is an Art which may not bee too vulgar, lest their Romane policies be too farre divulged. But by this it is easie to perceive what a silly excuse it is which *Baronius* useth in this cause; blaming *Vigilius* for coming to *Constantinople*, as if not the Popes owne hereticall minde, but the ayre of *Constantinople* had wrought such effects, as to produce that hereticall, and yet as they count it, *Apostolicall*

*Constitution* in defence of the  
Three Chapters.

FINIS.

*Laus Deo sine fine.*

---

*Errata hac corrigit benevolus Lector.*

*In Textu.*

Pag. 48. lin. 1. read *Theodorus*. *ibid.* lin. 9. *diptisiti*. p. 509. l. 14. *est*. p. 99. l. 3. *John B.* p. 115. l. 38. *Catholikes*. p. 141. l. 35. *Simus*, he was. p. 145. l. 39. *Son of God*. p. 163. *prope finem*, substances. p. 164. l. 5. explanation. p. 172. l. 10. of the Pope. p. 182. l. 45. their presence. p. 199. *prope finem*, *Catholikes*. p. 216. l. 17. *it*. p. 224. l. 25. *Popes*. p. 227. l. 5. *yeeld*. p. 289. l. 33. *the*. p. 350. l. 30. *equipare*. p. 425. l. 8. where is. *ibid.* l. 27. *Commans*. *ibid.* *Marcellinus*. l. 42. *inflamed*. p. 442. *in fine*, *Euphemia*. p. 462. l. 11. quarrels with Pope. p. 465. l. 35. all this time. p. 478. l. 23. it was written. p. 495. l. 37. *poysoner of*. p. 500. l. 35. *right hand*.

*In Margine.*

Pa. 9. lit. (c). lege, *Marforum*. p. 67. lit. (c). *Antiochennum*. p. 233. lit. (f). *emissam*. *ibid.* lit. (c). *corrupted*. p. 409. lit. (c). *commentitias & suppositicias*. p. 410. lit. (q). *Confilij* 5. p. 437. lit. (l). *Concilij* 5. *Coll.* 5.

---



Exhibit 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 9

1000

[illegible]

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and titles, including "The Hon. Mr. Justice" and "The Hon. Mr. Justice".

# AN ALPHABETICALL TABLE OF THE CHIEFE THINGS CONTAINED IN THIS TREATISE.

A.



*Crisin* Councils not so intire, but there may be faults from the exscriber, pag. 433. Sect. 17, 18. *Acts* of the fift Council unjustly excepted against by *Baronius*, pa. 379. sect. 3, 4.

*Agnostes* and other sectaries called *Acephali* p. 3. sect. 6.

*Agapetus* lost nothing by the Emperours presence, p. 464. sect. 5.

*Antichrist*: the Pope fift *Antichrist* nascent; secondly, crescent; thirdly, regnant; fourthly, in their *Laterane* Councell he was *Antichrist* triumphant, pa. 186. sect. 24.

*Anthimus* a Catholike in shew and outward profession, p. 157. sect. 4.

*Anastasius* narration not helped by *Binius*, p. 458. sect. 23.

*Anastasius* a fabler, p. 256. sect. 23. and pa. 447. sect. 12. &c.

The *Author* of that *Apologicall* Epistle published Anno 1601. a vaunting *Braggadocchio*, p. 205. sect. 10.

To *Assent* to the Popes or to their Cathedral definitions in a cause of faith, makes one an heretike, pa. 172. sect. 6.

*Author* of the Edict was *Iustinian* himselfe, p. 366. sect. 6, 7.

B.

*Baronius* nice in approving the Epistle of *Ibas*, and why, p. 128. sect. 22.

*Baronius* wittingly obstinate in maintaining the heresie of *Nestorius*, by approving the later

part of that epistle, p. 129. sect. 24, 25. and p. 31. sect. 28.

*Baronius* sports himselfe with contradictions, p. 131. sect. 27.

*Baronius* revileth the cause of the Three Chapt. p. 361. sect. 1.

*Baronius* Annals not altogether intire, pag. 435. sect. 19.

*Baronius* by his own reasons proves his Annals to be untrue, p. 436. sect. 19. in fine, & sect. 20. &c.

*Baronius* holds it dangerous for *Vigilius* to leave Rome to come to Constantinople, p. 462. sect. 1, 2.

*Bellisarius*, most renowned, save in the matter of *Silverius*, p. 470. sect. 11.

*Bellarmino* and *Baronius* at variance about the Epistle of *Vigilius* to *Anthimus*, *Severus*, and others, p. 477. sect. 19, 20. *Baronius* first reason to disprove it, is taken from the inscription p. 477. in fine, & p. 478. sect. 21, 22, 23. &c. his second reason, from the subscription, pa. 482. sect. 26. his last reason is, because hee was not upbraided for it by the Emperour and others, p. 483. sect. 27.

*Bellarmino* *traxit* to know when a Council decreeth any doctrine *tanquam de fide*, pa. 40. sect. 9. &c.

*Baronius* vilifieth the fift generall Council, p. 266. sect. 2.

The Banishment of *Vigilius* after the fift Council a fiction, p. 250. sect. 16. and p. 253. sect. 19. When and for what *Vigilius* was banished, p. 252. sect. 18.

*Baronius* his three reasons for *Vigilius* his consenting to the Synod after his exile, p. 245. sect. 8. First, from the testimony of *Evagrius*, sect. ibid. the second from the fact of *Iustinian* in restoring *Vigilius*, p. 247. sect. 11. the third

## An Alphabetical Table.

of *Vigilius* consenting to the Synod, taken from the words of *Liberatus*, *He was afflicted, not crowned*: p. 160. sect. 30.

### C.

**C**onstitution of *Vigilius* sent unto the Synod, pag. 8. sect. 4. *in fine*, the summe of the Constitution was the defence of the Three Chapters, p. 10. sect. 8. &c.

The Council refuteth the Popes decree and ground of it, p. 14. sect. 1, 2. &c.

The Council condemneth and accurseth the Popes decree, p. 17. sect. 6. and p. 22. sect. 15, 16.

The Councils decree consonant to Scripture, p. 26. sect. 24.

The fifth Council approved by succeeding Councils and Popes, p. 27. sect. 26. and how long, p. 29. sect. 29. &c.

Councils above the Pope, p. 29. sect. 30, 31.

The Cause of the Three Chapters, a cause of faith, p. 37. sect. 3. 4. &c. professed by *Baronius*, p. 42. sect. 14. a tryall of mens faith, p. 362. sect. 4.

The Council proposeth their decree about them *tanquam de fide*, p. 41. sect. 13.

The Churches in the East divided from the West about the three Chapters, p. 39. sect. 7.

The fifth Council explaineth a former definition of faith, made no decree to condemne any new heresie, p. 46. sect. 20, 21.

Fifth Council of authority without the Popes approbation, p. 268. sect. 5, 6, &c. it was neither hereticall, nor schismaticall, p. 269. sect. 7. it was assembled with the Popes consent, p. 272. sect. 12, 13.

Corruptions crept into some synodall acts, are not just causes of rejecting others of that Council, p. 378. sect. 3.

The Council of Chalcedon held Christ to be *unum de sancta Trinitate*, p. 382. sect. 8. 3. the Council of Chalcedon not corrupted, p. 384. sect. 6, 7.

The Constitution of *Vigilius* no part of the synodall acts, p. 399. sect. 1, 2, 3. not published in the Synod, p. 401. sect. 4.

*Chrysostomes* bones not translated from Comana to Constantinople, p. 426. sect. 3.

Council against Council at Ephesus, p. 113. sect. 2.

The Church may binde or loose a man after death, p. 53. sect. 15, 16.

The Church cannot loose those who dye impenitent, p. 55. sect. 20, 21.

*Coronati et non coronati*, as two sorts, so two rewards of professors, p. 263. sect. 43.

A Council is approved, though the Pope approve it not, p. 275. sect. 17, 18.

Generall Councils have sought the Popes approbation, p. 287. sect. 34.

*Cyrill* clears himselfe of Nestorianisme, p. 123. sect. 16.

### D.

**V**Whether a dead man may *noviter* be condemned, is a question of faith, p. 48. sect. 3.

That a dead man may be condemned, is the judgement of Fathers, p. 49. sect. 6. the judgement of provinciall Synods, p. 50. sect. 7. the judgement of generall Councils, *ibid.* sect. 7. the judgement of *Baronius*, p. 51. sect. 10.

Defenders of the Popes infallibility accused by the Council, p. 24. sect. 20, 21, 22.

*Dioscorus* being hereticall judged *Ibas* his profession hereticall, therefore the profession of *Ibas* must be orthodoxall. *Vigilius* his reason, p. 151. sect. 29.

Defenders of the three Chapters heretikes, p. 171. sect. 4.

Divination or Mathematicall predictions, nor allowable, p. 343. sect. 28.

*Damnus* his action not inserted at Chalcedon, p. 44. sect. 9.

To dissent from the Pope in a cause of faith makes not one an heretike, p. 171. sect. 5.

Many Doctrines of their Romish Church may be held, except that of the Popes infallibility, and yet the party that holds them no papist, p. 182. sect. 21. *in fine*.

### E.

**E**pistle of *Ibas* wholly hereticall, p. 19. sect. 8, 9. and p. 24. sect. 19.

*Eunomius* approved not any part of this Epistle, p. 20. sect. 14.

*Eunomius* approved the confession of *Ibas*, p. 21. sect. 14.

The Epistle of *Ibas* not approved at Chalcedon, p. 107. sect. 2, 3, 4. &c.

The Epistle was truly the writing of *Ibas*, p. 109. sect. 5, 6.

At *Ephesus* a great rent and division between *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, *ibid.*

At *Ephesus* *Cyrill* was deposed by the Conveticle, *ibid.* sect. 3.

The Emperour ignorant for a time of the division betweene *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, p. 15. sect. 4.

The Emperour had knowledge of the division by a letter brought into the Court by a beggar, *ibid.*

[*Ensta*]



## An Alphabetical Table.

**Eustathius** full of forgeries, p. 340. sect. 24, 25, &c.

**Eusebius** not banished for not consenting to the heresie of the Phantasickes, p. 341. sect. 25.

**Eusebius** given to divination, hereticall, and what it was, p. 343. sect. 28, 29. for these supposed to be banished, *ibid.*

**Evaristus** full of fables, p. 345. sect. 30. &c.

The Emperours Edict reviled by **Baronius**, p. 363. sect. 1. it was not repugnant to the orthodoxall faith, it was no seminary of sedition, *ibid.* sect. 3, 4.

The Epistle of **Ibas** condemned by the Council at Chalcedon, p. 381. sect. 1. the Epistle in **Constantine** not **Infinians**, p. 392. sect. 1.

Epistles writ to **Dioscorus** and **Leo** were forged, and not **Theodorus**, p. 417. sect. 7, 8. and p. 444. sect. 8.

Epistles by their erroneous inscription are not proved to be forged, p. 419. sect. 9, 10. &c.

**Epiphanius** his writing against images read in the second Nicene Synode, and by them rejected, p. 109. sect. 7. the booke was the booke of **Epiphanius**, p. 112. sect. 12.

The explanation meant by **Ibas** was a condemning of the twelve chapters of **Cyrill**, p. 152. sect. 42, 43. a condemning of the faith, p. 160. sect. 44. the like explanation meant by **Vigilius**, p. 166. sect. 52.

F.

**Facundus** set on by the Pope writ against the Emperours Edict, p. 214. sect. 4.

**Facundus** and **Baronius** revile the Emperor, p. 215. sect. 4.

**Facundus** an enemy to the Catholike faith, p. 371. sect. 13.

The Foundation being hereticall, poysons all which is built thereon, p. 190. sect. 29, 30.

Faith: unto certainty of faith two things required, p. 182. sect. 20.

G.

**Gombarius** not treacherously slaine by **Bellisarius**, p. 448. sect. 15.

**Gregory** his words and meaning pretended by **Basil** about the three Chapt. explained, p. 43. sect. 16, 17. &c.

H.

**Heretikes** dying, dye not in the peace of the Church, pag. 99. and pag. 61. §. 6.

**Heretike** with pertinacy differs much from an error, p. 61. *infra*. First, in regard of matter, p. 81. sect. 8. secondly, for the manner, *ibid.* sect. 9. thirdly, in regard of the persons who erre, p. 64. sect. 11. fourthly, in regard of the Churches judgement, *ibid.* sect. 12.

**Heretike** in its owne habit doth lesse harme, p. 103. sect. 17.

**Heretikes** in words orthodoxall, in sense and meaning hereticall, p. 147. sect. 20. proved in **Vitalis**, *ibid.*

An **hereticall** profession may be in termes orthodoxall, *ibid.* sect. 21.

**Heretikes** pretend to hold with ancient Councils, p. 201. sect. 4, 5.

Worst **Heretikes** are the moderne Romanists, p. 204. sect. 10.

**Heretikes** lyars in their profession, p. 207. sect. 15.

**Heretikes** profession contradictory to it selfe, p. 208. sect. 16.

An **hereticall** profession gives denomination to a man rather than an orthodoxall, p. 208. sect. 17, 18.

**Heretike** is a tryall of mens love to God, p. 361. sect. 2.

I.

**Ibas** his epistle unto **Mari** an heretike of Persia, p. 125. sect. 19. full of Nestorianisme.

**Ibas** denyeth God to be incarnate, and **Mari** the mother of God, p. 122. sect. 13.

**Ibas** professeth two natures and one person in Christ, p. 139. sect. 1. and p. 143. sect. 9.

**Ibas** his consenting to the Ephesine Council proves not his epistle Catholike, p. 154. sect.

**Ibas** consented not to **Cyrill** upon his explanation, p. 155. sect. 35. &c. **Vigilius** his first reason explained in five severall things: first, the Popes Rhetorick, sect. 35. second, his Chronology of time, sect. 36. third, his Logicke, sect. 40.

the fourth and fifth, his Ethicall and Theologicall knowledge, sect. 41. *vide* p. 168. sect. 55.

**Ibas** embraced the union in Nestorianisme, p. 125. sect. 19.

**Ibas** professed not the epistle to bee his, as the Acts declare, p. 386. sect. 2.

The Image of Christ sent to **Abgarus**, a fable, p. 346. sect. 32.

**Infallibility** of the Popes judgement the foundation of a papists faith, p. 34. sect. 34. and a doctrine of the Romish Church, p. 172. sect. 7, 8, &c. and p. 177. sect. 13, 14.

**Infallibility** of the Popes judgement in causes of faith defended by any, makes the defender

## An Alphabetical Table.

der hereticall, p. 61. sec. 6. and p. 63. sec. 10. and to dye out of the peace of the Church, *ibid.*

*Infallibility* of the Popes judgement taught by commending the Churches judgement to be infallible, and generall Councils, p. 173. sec. 8. and by the Church they understand the Pope, sec. 8. 9. and p. 178. sec. 15.

*Infallibility* only peculiar to the Pope, p. 174 sec. 11.

*Infallibility* of the Popes judgement is hereticall, p. 180. sec. 18.

*Iustinian* his Edict for defence of the three Chapters, p. 3. sec. 7.

*Iustinian* the Emperour spared *Vigilius* from banishment, and why, p. 257. sec. 26, 27.

*Iustinian* reviled by *Baronius*, p. 324. slandered to be illiterate, p. 325. sec. 3. 4. for making lawes in causes of faith, sec. 5, 6. for persecuting *Vigilius*, sec. 7.

*Iustinian* in his last age no Apathardokite, p. 330. sec. 8. and p. 331. sec. 12. &c. no disturber of the peace of the Church, p. 331. *in fine*.

*Iustinian* a defender of the faith, witness Pope *Agatho*, p. 256. sec. 16 witness the Rom. Synod, sec. 17. witness the sixt Council, sec. 18. witness Pope *Gregory*, sec. 19.

*Iustinian* no subverter of the faith, p. 349. sec. 37, 38.

*Iustinian* founded many stately Churches and Monasteries, p. 350. sec. 39.

*Iustinian* no subverter of the Empire, *ibid.* sec. 40.

*Iustinian* severely censured by *Baronius*, p. 354. sec. 45.

*Ierusalem* not advanced by the fift Synod to a Patriarchship, p. 430. sec. 1, 2, &c.

*Iustinian* *Dioclesian*-like caused not *Vigilius* to be beaten, p. 453. sec. 19.

*Iustinian* favoured not the heresie of *Anthimus*, p. 454. sec. 21.

K.

**T**He King of England refused to send to their Trent Councell, p. 308. sec. 24.

Kings and Emperours have onely right to call Councils, p. 239. sec. 5.

L.

**T**He *Laterane* Councell under *Leo* the 10. reprobated the Councell at *Constance* and *Basil* touching the authority of Gen: Councils p. 33. sec. 33.

The *Laterane* decree condemned by the University of Paris, p. 34. sec. 35.

The more learned the man is, the more dangerous are his heresies, p. 123. sec. 27.

*Lauber*, his zeale that hee would not communicate in both kindes; if the Pope as Pope should command him, p. 195. sec. 33.

*Liberatus* an unfit witness in the cause of the three Chapt. p. 373. sec. 15, 16.

*Leo* judged the Nicene Canons for the limits of Sees unalterable, p. 405. sec. 4.

*Leo*, his judgement erroneous for preheminency of Bishops, p. 400. sec. 4, 5.

*Leontius* no sufficient witness for the Epistle of *Theodoret*, p. 415. sec. 3.

*Laves* besides those in the Theodosian Code, p. 412. sec. 5, 6.

*Lawfull* Synods, and what makes them so, p. 282. sec. 24, 25, 26. &c.

To *Lawfull* Synods, besides an Episcopall confirmation, p. 281. sec. 25. &c. there is required a Regall or Imperiall, p. 285. sec. 31, 32.

*Lawfull* Councils require, first that the summons be generall, p. 292. sec. 3. secondly, that it be lawfull; thirdly, that it be orderly, *ibid.* sec. 4.

M.

**M**Ennas died in the 21. yeare of *Iustinian*; and the Pope excommunicated him in the 25. p. 237. sec. 18.

The *Matrones* of Rome entreated *Constantinus* to restore *Liberius*, 248. sec. 12.

Monkes of Sythia slandered by *Baronius* for falsifying the Acts of the Councell at Chalcedon, p. 383. sec. 4, 5.

*Monothelite* additions not extant in the fift Synod, p. 409. sec. 2, 3.

*Mennas* his confession to *Vigilius* a forgery, p. 441. sec. 2.

*Mennas* not excommunicated by *Vigilius*, p. 442. sec. 4, 5.

N.

**N**Epis died in an error onely, not in any formall heresie, p. 65. sec. 13.

The 2. *Nicene* assembly a conspiracy, p. 111. sec. 11. *in fine*.

*Nestorius* his bookes being restrained, the bookes of *Theodorus* and *Diodorus* were in more esteeme, p. 121. sec. 12.

The *Nestorians* forged a false union between *Iohn* and *Cyrrill*, p. 123. sec. 15. and p. 134. sec. 34.

The *Nestorians* confessed two natures and one person in Christ, and how, p. 144. how Catholikes confesse it, *ibid.* sec. 11, 12, 13.

*Nestorius* affirmeth the two natures to be two persons,

## An Alphabetical Table.

persons, p. 145. sect. 16. so *Theodorus* the Master of *Nestorius*, sect. 17. to affirmeth this, is plaine Nestorianisme, proved by *Iustinian*, p. 146. sect. 18. by *Pope John* the second.

The *Nestorians* in words orthodoxall, in sense and meaning hereticall, p. 147. sect. 20. and p. 448. sect. 22, 23. witness'd by *Iustinian*, p. 449. sect. 24. by the first Councell, sect. 25. by the epistle selfe, sect. 26, 27.

The *Nestorians* by Nature understand Persons, p. 162. sect. 26, 27.

The *Nestorians* slander *Cyrril* to teach two persons, p. 163. sect. 27.

*Narfes* for his piety and prudence beloved of *Iustinian*, p. 248. sect. 22.

*Narfes* intreated not for *Vigilius*, p. 249. sect. 14.

*Narfes* overcame not *Torilus*, if *Binius* his glosse be true, p. 458. sect. 23.

*Narfes* overcame not the Gothes by the intercession of *Mary*, p. 459. sect. 24.

O.

**T**He occasion of the first Councell was those *tria capitula*, p. 2. sect. 3.

*Origen* commended for his gifts and learning, p. 103. sect. 18.

*Origen* condemned by the Acts of the first Synod, p. 391. sect. 1, 2.

*Origens* cause not the cause of the first action in the first Synod, p. 393. sect. 3. nor the cause of the second action in the Synod, sect. 4.

The order of lawfull generall Councils; p. 304. sect. 19.

P.

**P**apists are truly such as ground upon the Popes infallibility, p. 187. sect. 26.

*Pope Vigilius* excommunicated in an African Synod, p. 236. sect. 16.

The *Pope* refuseth to come to the Synod, p. 4. sect. 2, 3, 4. and the true reason why, pag. 6. sect. 5.

The *Popes* presence not needfull in a generall Councell, p. 273. sect. 14, 15.

The *Pope* present in the first Councell by his letters of instruction, p. 274. sect. 16.

The *Popes* consent makes not a Councell to be approved, p. 275. sect. 27. *vid. lit. C.*

In the *Popes* intension there is as much authority, as in the *Pope* with a generall Councell, *Bellarmines* assertion, p. 174. sect. 10.

The *Pope* virtually both Church and Councell, p. 178. sect. 15. p. 180. sect. 17.

The name *Papist* not heard of till *Leo* the 10. p. 488. sect. 25. to be a *Pope* an happy thing, for all is held for truth that they define, pag. 233. sect. 16.

*Papist* had need of a strong faith, relying on the *Popes* judgement, p. 224. sect. 18.

*Paulus* Bishop of *Emisa* subscribed to the anathematizing of *Nestorius*, to perswade an union betweene *Iohn* and *Cyrril*, p. 133. sect. 3. his Sermon at *Alexandria*, containing an orthodoxall profession of the faith, p. 134. sec. 33.

*Palagius* *Pope* after *Vigilius*, consecrated by two Bishops onely and a Presbyter of *Ofria*, p. 242. sect. 4.

A *Pope* may erre personally, they say, but doctrinally he cannot, p. 244. sect. 7.

The *Pope* no competent Iudge of Protestants, being an enemy unto them, pag. 315. sect. 33.

*Pope Clements* epistle to *Iames* a forgery, p. 422. sect. 2.

*Paul* censured by some for an hot-headed person, 434. sect. 18. *in fine*.

R.

**T**He Church of *Rome* holdeth no doctrine by certainty of faith, p. 181. *in fine*, and p. 282. sect. 20. and p. 189. sect. 27, 28.

The *Romish* doctrines may bee held three wayes, p. 183. sect. 21. *in fine*. First, of them who hold the Scriptures for the foundation, p. 183. sect. 22. such were our forefathers. Second way, by grounding upon Scripture, but with pertinacy, p. 184. sect. 23. A third way of holding them, is on the *Popes* word, p. 185. sec. 24.

They of the *Romane* Church are heretikes; p. 192. sect. 31.

In their *Romane* Church no true holiness; p. 193. sect. 32.

They of the *Romish* Church are schismatickes; p. 196. sect. 34.

*Rome* miserably besieged by *Torilus*, p. 456. sect. 22.

*Ruba* not taken from *Alexandria*, pag. 407. sect. 8.

S.

**T**He Synod resolves to judge the controversy about the three Chapt. the *Pope* being absent, p. 7. sect. 1.

*Sergius* Bishop of *Cyrrus* deposed from his Bishopricke, p. 706. sect. 18.

*Scripture* being the ground of a mans faith is a comfort unto him, though in some things he



## An Alphabetical Table.

he erre, pa. 191. sect. 29. and p. 194. sect. 33.

Supremacy and infallibility are inseparably joyned, p. 176. sect. 12.

Schismatikes are not of the Church, pa. 199. sect. 39.

Profession of Scriptures excuse not from heresie, p. 326. sect. 13.

Soudas a fabler, p. 326. sect. 4.

Sophia built by Constantine, the mirrour of ages, p. 350. sect. 39.

Switzers order in judgement, p. 394. in fine.

Shamefull matters not added to the Acts of the fifth Synod, p. 408. sect. 1. 4.

Silverius died of famine in the Iland Palmaria, p. 472. sect. 13.

Synods: what makes them lawfull, p. 282. and what unlawfull, p. 306. sect. 20.

### T.

**T**heodorus not condemned in his life time, p. 47. sect. 2.

Theodorus died not in the peace of the Church p. 59. sect. 1, 2, 3, 4. and p. 66.

Theodorus condemned by Cyrill and Proclus, p. 68. sect. 2, 3. and p. 73. sect. 11. &c. by the Ephesine Councell, p. 69. sect. 4. &c. by the Armenian Councell, p. 72. sect. 10. by the Emperours Edict, sec. 13, 14. &c. by the Catholike Church, p. 76. sect. 19.

Theodoret writ against Cyrill and the true faith, p. 62. sect. 4, 5.

Theodoret very resolute for Nestorianisme, p. 93. sect. 6.

Theodoret his writings condemned by the Councell of Chalcedon, p. 96. sect. 12, 13. and p. 101. sect. 23. and by Cyrill, p. 98. sect. 16, 17.

Theodoret was not injured, though his writings were condemned, p. 102. sect. 24, 26.

Theodoret a man of rare worth and learning, p. 104. sect. 29, 30.

Taciturnity: the decree of taciturnity, and what effect it tooke, p. 225. sect. 2, 3, 4. a meere fiction, p. 228. sect. 5, 6, &c.

Trent Bishops were the Popes creatures, pa. 319. sect. 37.

The Trent Councell conspired against Protestants, p. 314. sect. 32.

Theodora unjustly reviled by Baronius, pag. 355. sect. 1.

Theodora favoured Ansbimus as being orthodoxall, p. 358. sect. 5.

Theodora not excommunicated by Vigilius, p. 359. sect. 6.

Theodorus Bishop of Caesarea no heretike, p. 368. sect. 9, 10.

Theodorus of Caesarea no Origenist, pa. 374. sec. 17. he mismed not the Acts of the 5. Synod, p. 697. sec. 7.

Theodosius law in the Code not corrupted, p. 411. sect. 4.

Theodoret wrote that Epistle mentioned in the fifth Synod, p. 413. sec. 1. hee wrote it after the union, p. 416. sec. 6, 7. and p. 426. sect. 12.

Theodora writ not to Vigilius to restore Ansbimus, p. 449. sect. 16, 17.

Theodora sent not Ansbimus Scribe to Rome for Vigilius, p. 452. sect. 18.

Theodoret sets forth his owne orthodoxy, p. 417. sect. 7.

Theodoret condemned by the Councell at Ephesus, p. 419. sect. 10.

Theodoret writ an epistle to John of Antioch, p. 422. sect. 1.

Theodoret rejoyceth over Cyrill being dead, p. 427. sect. 5.

A Trechery intended in Queene Elizabeths time by a deepe dissembler, p. 488. in medio.

### V.

**V**igilius alledgeth counterfeite writings in stead of Fathers, p. 78. sect. 23, 24. &c.

Vigilius denieth the knowne writings of Theodorus, p. 82. sect. 31.

Vigilius imputeth an heresie to the Councell of Ephesus, p. 84. sect. 34.

Vigilius untruly pretendeth the Councell of Chalcedon, p. 84. sect. 35, 36.

Vigilius falsely pretendeth Iustinian for Theodorus, p. 86. sect. 38.

Vigilius durst not himselfe condemne Theodorus, p. 88. sect. 41, 42.

Vigilius would not permit any other to condemne Theodorus, pa. 89. sect. 45. and pag. 99. sect. 18.

Vigilius anathematizeth those that condemne Theodorus, p. 90. sect. 46.

Vigilius accuseth the Councell of Chalcedon as dissemblers, p. 94. sect. 8.

Vigilius condemneth Nestorianisme onely in shew, p. 100. sect. 20, 21.

Vigilius and Baronius appeare in their lively colours for Nestorianisme, p. 112. sect. 1. and p. 27. sect. 2.

Union made betweene Iohn and Cyrill, p. 116. sect. 5. and how concluded, p. 133. sect. 30, 31.

Vigilius from the Union labours to prove Ibas a Catholike, p. 117. sect. 7.

Vigilius approveth the whole epistle of Ibas p. 118. sect. 9.

Union in Nestorianisme, was that union which

## An Alphabetical Table.

which *Ibas* embraced, p. 127. sec. 14.

That *Vigilius* decreed this union in Nestorianisme with a settled affection, is probable, pa. 129. sec. 23.

*Vigilius* approveth the confession made by *Ibas*, p. 141. sec. 3, 4, 5.

*Vigilius* his reasons to prove *Ibas* profession to be Catholike, p. 151. sec. 29, &c.

*Vigilius* with *Ibas* approveth two persons in Christ, p. 164. sec. 48, 49, &c.

*Vigilius* his pretence to defend the Council at Chalcedon, p. 200. sec. 1, 2.

*Vigilius* hereticall, notwithstanding his profession of Councils, p. 208. sec. 17.

*Vigilius* is said to have approved the fifth Council, p. 213. sec. 1.

*Vigilius* his carriage in this cause, and his 4. severall judgements or changings, *ibid.* sect. 2. & in sequentibus.

*Vigilius* for his decree of silence is to be judged an heretike, p. 229. sec. 6.

*Vigilius* after exile made no decree to approve the fifth Council, p. 241. sec. 2, 3. the western Church approved it not, §. 4. the Council of Aquileia doubted to approve it, sec. 5. *Vigilius* not so much as by a private consent did approve it, *ibid.* pa. 245. sect. 7. in fine. & sect. 8.

*Vigilius* consented to the Synod, but not to the synodall decree, p. 245. sec. 8.

*Vigilius* was afflicted, and what his afflictions were, p. 264. sec. 37, 38.

*Vigiles* yielded himself to *Bellisarius*, p. 447. sec. 16.

*Vigilius* lost not by his going to Constantinople, p. 463. sec. 3, 4, 5, &c. & p. 466. sec. 6, & 7, 8.

*Vigilius* his entrance into the Popedome, and the manner of it, p. 468. sec. 10.

*Vigilius* his promise to the Emperesse to restore *Anthimus*, p. 469. sec. 11.

*Vigilius* keeps not promise with the Emperesse, *ibid.* sec. 12.

*Vigilius* resignes the Popedome, and is anew elected into it, p. 472. sec. 14, 15.

*Vigilius* exactly described by *Baronius*, pag. 474. sec. 16.

*Vigilius* writ unto *Anthimus*, and other Eutychians, as unto Catholikes, p. 475. in fine.

*Vigilius* laboured to undermine the Council of Chalcedon, p. 476.

*Vigilius* accursed not *Dioscorus*, but *Nestorius*, p. 482. sec. 26.

*Vigilius* writ this Epistle to *Anthimus*, after the death of *Silverius*, p. 486.

*Vigilius* in some things alike, in others unlike to *K. Saul*, p. 487. in fine. sect. 30, 31.

*Vigilius* was hereticall, and a dissembler, pa. 488. sec. 33. a dissembler in the faith, in heart hereticall, p. 490. sec. 33. & insequent.

*Vigilius* as Pope defined against the faith, p. 497. sec. 3, &c.

*Vigilius* his death, and the manner of it, pa. 504. sect. 52, &c.

## F I N I S.